









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation







94

1375  
1

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

---

A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT,

*MANAGING EDITOR.*

JAMES. W. BRIGHT, HANS C. G. VON JAGEMANN,

HENRY ALFRED TODD,

*ASSOCIATE EDITORS.*

---

VOLUME X.

1895.

39461  
2613196-

BALTIMORE: THE EDITORS.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## ORIGINAL ARTICLES.

Warren, F. M., Unity of Place in "Le Cid."	1-10
Wiener, Leo, German Loan-Words and the Second Sound Shifting.....	10-19
Keidel, George C., Jubinal's Évangile aux Femmes.....	19-21
Bright, James W., The Earliest Use of the Word <i>Geology</i> .....	21
de Haan, F., Barlaam and Joasaph in Spain.	22-34
Grecne, Herbert E., The Twelfth Annual Convention of the Modern Language Association of America.....	65-75
Nollen, John S., The Ethics of Translation.	76-77
Coblentz, H. E., Some Suggested Rime Emendations to the York Mystery Plays....	77-81
Wiener, Leo, The Ferrara Bible.....	81-85
Bright, James W., Notes on the Beowulf....	85-88
Harris, M. A., The Origin of the Seventeenth Century Idea of Humours.....	88-92
Baldwin, Charles S., The Verb in the "Morte d'Arthur.".....	92-94
Wood, Francis A., On the Origin of <i>i</i> and <i>u</i> in Aorist-Presents in Germanic.....	94-97
Francke, Kuno, a Parallel to Goethe's Euphorion.....	129-131
Williams, R. O., <i>Only</i> , Adversative Misplacement of Adverb.....	131-136
Bright, James W., Notes on <i>Fæder Larc-widas</i> .....	136-137
de Haan, F., Barlaam and Joasaph in Spain. II.....	137-146
Keidel, George C., Note on Folsiffe and Similar Expressions in Old-French Literature.....	146-158
Walker, J. Charles, Note on Elision in Modern Italian.....	159-162
Lodeman, A., Victor Hugo in the Estimation of his Countrymen.....	193-207
Lang, R. H., The Relations of the Earliest Portuguese Lyric school with the Troubadours and Trouvères.....	207-231
Chamberlain, A. F., Mutation of Gender in the Canadian-French Dialect of Quebec.....	232-236
Bowen, Mary, Some New Notes on Sidney's Poems.....	236-246
Diekhoff, T., "Vergeben" in Goethe's Tasso, II, 3; l. 1404.....	257-259
Blackburn, F. A., Note on the Phoenix, Verse 151.....	259-260
Shipley, George, Arrangement of the Canterbury Tales.....	260-279
Lentzner, Karl, Historical Outline of the Danish Language.....	321-336
Leser, Eugene, Modern French <i>gêne</i> = Old French <i>gehine</i> , from <i>gehür</i> .....	336-337
Simonds, A. B., Two Unedited Chansons of Robert la Chièvre de Reims.....	337-340
Kuhns, L. Oscar, Some Verbal Resemblances	

in Orlando Furioso and the Divina Commedia.....	340-348
Wood, Francis A., Apparent Absence of Umlaut in O. E.....	347-350
Armstrong, E. C., The Position of the Secondary Accent in French Etymons having more than two Pretonic Syllables. I.....	350-360
Hunt, T. W., Educational English.....	385-388
Rennert, Hugo A., Two Spanish Manuscript Cancioneros.....	389-392
Scott, Fred N., The Misplacement of <i>Only</i> ..	392-401
Pietsch, K., The Authorship of Flamenca...	401-403
Whitney, A. W., The Ell and Yard.....	403-406
Matthews, Brander, Another Note on Recent Criticisms.....	448-454
Lewis, E. H., Are the Hackman-Reay Love-Letters Genuine?.....	454-464
Cutting, S. W., Faust's First Monologue and the Earth-Spirit-Scene in the Light of Recent Criticism.....	464-475
Baskervill, W. M., The Etymology of <i>Yeoman</i> .....	475-478
Otto, H. L. W., Gerineldo II.....	478-500
Bright, James W., Karl Lentzner.....	500-501

## REVIEWS.

Wilmanns, W., Deutsche Grammatik [B. J. Vos].....	34-39
Herdler, A. W., A Scientific French Reader. [A. Lodeman].....	39-41
van Daell, A. N., An Introduction to French Authors. [A. Lodeman].....	41-42
Pendleton, A. C., Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie. [T. Logie].....	42-44
de Vigny, Alfred, Cinq-Mars ou une Conjuratation Sous Louis XIII. [Edwin S. Lewis].....	44-51
Joynes, Edward S., Minimum French Grammar and Reader. [A. Rambeau]..	
Fontaine, C., Livre de Lecture et de Conversation. [A. Rambeau].....	
van Daell, A. N., An Introduction to the French Language. [A. Rambeau]..	
Kroeh, C. F., The Living Method for Learning how to think in French. [A. Rambeau].....	
Bechtel, A., Enseignement par les Yeux. [A. Rambeau]..	
Bechtel, A., Hoelzel's Wandbilder. [A. Rambeau].....	
Grandgent, C. H., A Short French Grammar. [A. Rambeau]...	
Grandgent, C. H., French Lessons and Exercises.....	
Scholl, Sigmund, Die Vergleichliche in Montchrestiens Tragödien. [F. M. Warren].	97-100
Hall, John R. Clark, A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for the Use of Students. [Frank H. Chase].....	100-103



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Thorkelsson, Jón., Beyging Sterkra Sag- norða í Íslensku. [Wm. H. Carpenter].	103-105
Emerson, O. F., The History of the English Language. [Charles F. McClunpha].	105-109
Zumbini, B., Studi di Letterature Straniere. [Lewis F. Mott].	109-111
McLaughlin, Edw. T., Studies in Mediaeval Life and Literature. [Gustav Gruener].	111-117
Streitberg, Wilhelm, Perfective und Im- perfective Actionsart im German- ischen. [Edwin C. Roedder].	
Recha, Carl, Zur Frage über den Ursprung der Perfectivierenden Function der Verbalpræfixe. [Edwin C. Roedder].	117-124
Wustmann, Rudolf, Verba Perfectiva Nam- entlich im Heliand. [Edwin C. Roed- der].	
Carruth, W. H., Wallenstein von Schiller. [A. R. Hohlfeld].	162-172
Breul, Karl, Wallenstein von Schiller. [A. R. Hohlfeld].	
Meyer, Richard M., Goethe. [Max Winkler].	172-175
Koschwitz, Eduard, Ueber die Provenzal- ischen Feliber und ihre Vorgänger. [E. C. Armstrong].	175-177
Pollard, Alfred W., Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. [George Hemp].	177-180
Rollins, George W., Preparatory French Reader. [T. A. Jenkins].	180-182
Rojas, Julio, El Pájaro Verde. [F. de Haan].	
Herdler, A. W., Partir á Tiempo. [F. de Haan].	
de la Cortina, R. D., El Final de Norma. [F. de Haan].	182-196
Herdler, A. W., El Desdén con el Desdén. [F. de Haan].	
Duque, Luis, Spanish in Spanish. [F. de Haan].	
Joynes, Edward S., Maria Stuart. [J. T. Hatfield].	
Rhodes, Lewis A., Maria Stuart. [J. T. Hatfield].	246-248
Breul, Karl, Maria Stuart. [J. T. Hatfield].	
Smith, C. A., Repetition and Parallelism in English Verse. [C. H. Ross].	248-251
Garner, Samuel, Ruy Blas par Victor Hugo. [John E. Matzke].	279-285
Lockwood, Lessons in English. [A. E. Egge].	285-292
Fontaine, C., Fleurs de France. [B. L. Bowen].	
Fontaine, C., Les Historiens français du xix. siècle. [B. L. Bowen].	293-296
Edgren, A. H., Le Tour du Monde en quatre-vingts jours. [B. L. Bowen].	
Groth, P., A Danish and Dano-Norwegian Grammar. [D. K. Dodge].	296-299
Lentzner, K., A Short Scandinavian Gram- mar. [D. K. Dodge].	
Muzzarelli, A., The Academic French Course. [A. Lodeman].	299-300
Bercy, Paul, Lectures faciles pour l'étude du Français. [A. Lodeman].	
Lewis, E. S., Michel Strogoff. [W. Stuart Symington].	300-305
Verne, Jules, Letter from.....	
Lewis, Edwin S., Michel Strogoff.....	305-308
Kluge, Friedrich, Deutsche Studenten- sprache. [W. H. Hulme].	308-316
Pellissier, Georges, Contemporary French Literature. [F. M. Warren].	360-370

Jenkins, Thomas A., L'Espurgatoire Seint Patriz of Marie de France. [H. A. Todd]	370-372
Leune, M. A., Difficult Modern French: Les Décadents. [Camille Fontaine].	372-378
Font, Auguste, Essai sur Favart et les Ori- gines de la Comédie Mêlée de Chant. [Phillip Ogden].	406-421
Wüllfing, J. Ernst, Die Syntax in den Wer- ken Alfreds des Grossen. [Frank H. Chase].	421-429
Warren, F. M., A History of the Novel Pre- vious to the Seventeenth Century. [R. W. Deering].	429-435
Kuhns, L. Oscar, A Selection from the Poetry and Comedies of Alfred de Musset. [B. L. Bowen].	435-439
Edgren, A. H., Les Origines de la France Con- temporaine. [B. L. Bowen].	439-441
Betz, Louis P., Heine in Frankreich. [John S. Nollen].	441-443

## CORRESPONDENCE.

Child, C. G. Nodier and Peter Ibbetson.....	51-54
Browne, William Hand, Explanaton Wanted of Gaelic Words.....	54
Dodge, D. K., Luther om Messens Canon....	54-56
Cook, Albert S., The Old English Optative of Unexpectant Wishing.....	56
Menger, L. Emil, French Pronunciation.....	57-58
Williams, R. O., Dr. Hall's "Rejoinder".....	58-62
Tupper, Jas. W., Deor's Complaint.....	125-127
Child, C. G., Verse as Prose in the 'Ayenbite.'	127
Kroch, Chas. F., A Protest.....	127-128
Garner, Samuel, French Literature.....	128
Marden, C. C., Some Manuscript Readings in the Poema de Fernan Gonzalez.....	252-253
Napier, A. S., Middle English Citation.....	253
Henckles, Théodore, The Authorship of Flamencia.....	316-318
Williams, R. O., A Correction.....	318-319
Carpenter, Wm. H., Books Printed in Ice- land.....	319-320
Hatfield, James T., Dies Geschlecht.....	320
Child, C. G., Chaucer's House of Fame and Boccaccio's Amoroza Visione.....	379-384
Karsten, Gustaf E., Indiana Philological Society.....	384
Garner, Samuel, Chival de Fond.....	444
Wood, Francis A., Gothic hatpt.....	444
Harris, Herbert, Was Paradise Lost Sug- gested by the Mystery Plays?.....	445-446
Payne, William Morton, Philological Con- gress.....	501
Greene, Herbert Eveleth, Philological Con- gress.....	502
Symington, Jr., W. Stuart, Michel Strogoff Again.....	503-506
Warren F. M., The Novel and the Story..	506-508
Schmidt-Wartenberg, S., The Central Modern Language Conference.....	508-511
Karsten, G. E., The Central Modern Lan- guage Conference.....	511

## BRIEF MENTION.

62-64, 253-254, 320, 446, 512.

## JOURNAL NOTICES.

255-256, 447-448.

## PERSONAL.

64.

# INDEX TO VOLUME x, 1895.

I

# INDEX TO VOLUME X, 1895.

Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte.....	127	Williams, R. O., Dr. Hall's "Rejoinder".....	29-31
de Vigny, Alfred, Cinq Mars ou une Conjuraton		— <i>only</i> , Adversative Misplacement of Adverb —..	66-58
Sous Louis XIII (see Lewis).....	21-21	— Correction.....	159-160
Vos, B. J., Wilmanns: Deutsche Grammatik.....	17-20	Wilmanns, W., Deutsche Grammatik (see Vos)...	17-20
<b>Walker, J. Charles</b> , Note on Elision in Modern		Winkler, Max, Meyer: Goethe.....	86-88
Italian.....	80-81	Wood, Francis A., On the Origin of <i>ī</i> and <i>ū</i> in	
Wallenstein von Schiller.....	81-86	Aorist Presents in Germanic.....	47-49
Warren, F. M., Unity of Place in "Le Cid".....	1-5	— Apparent Absence of Umlaut in O. E.,.....	174-175
— Scholl: Die Vergleiche in Montchrestiens		— Gothic <i>haiþi</i> .....	222
Trilogien.....	49-50	Wülfing, J. Ernst, Die Syntax in den Werken Al-	
— Pellissier: Contemporary French Literature....	180-185	fred des Grossen (see Chase).....	211-215
— A History of the Novel Previous to the Seven-		Wustmann, Rudolf, Verba Perfectiva Namentlich	
teenth Century (see Deering).....	215-218	im Heliand (see Roedder).....	59-62
— The Novel and the Story.....	253-254	<b>Yeoman</b> , The Etymology of —.....	238-239
Whitney, A. W., The Ell and Yard.....	202-203	York Mystery Plays, Some Suggested Rime	
Wiener, Leo, German Loan-Word and the Second		Emendations to the —.....	39-41
Sound Shifting.....	5-10	<b>Zumbini, B.</b> Studi di Letterature Straniere.....	55-56
— The Ferrara Bible, I.....	41-53		



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, January, 1895.

## UNITY OF PLACE IN *LE CID*.

THIS heading may be considered begging the question at issue, since *le Cid* is generally supposed to disregard unity of place, and in fact does so in the performances given by the Comédie française at the present day. Still the critics are by no means agreed that the stage managers are right in their conclusions, though they themselves are uncertain as to what the original setting really was. Voltaire—to cite one of the most eminent among them—thinks that unity of place would be evident to the spectator, if *le Cid* were only produced with scenery worthy of its author, in other words if it used the multiplex stage decoration.

So the first point to be settled would be the kind of scenery which Corneille found ready at hand, the scenery he inherited from his predecessors; and the second to ascertain how he adapted this scenery to his own ends. Rigal, in his important work on Alexandre Hardy, has discussed the first question at length, and has given his conclusions regarding the second. He shows beyond a doubt that, at the time when Corneille began to solicit popular applause at the Marais theater, the multiplex scenery was the usual form of stage setting, though movable scenery was often employed. The multiplex form of decoration had been handed down from the open-air stage of the Fraternity of the Passion to the more restricted stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. In it the various settings for the different localities were juxtaposed on the stage—centered around the street or square in the middle—and remained there throughout the entire play, the changes being indicated by the actors going from one to the other as occasion demanded. For instance, in a tragicomedy of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, the centre of the stage might be an open space representing a square in Rome, the right a series of houses extending from Rome to Jerusalem, and the left, perhaps, the Mediterranean sea. A curtain in the background of

the open space might rise at the opportune moment to reveal another house or street of the imperial city. To be sure, this scenery was the property of one particular theater, but at the same time it must have been the model for the decorations prepared for Mondory's troupe of the Marais, and have differed from them only in extent and variety.

The stage, which Corneille as a citizen of the provinces knew, must have been more simple than even the modified scenery of the Marais; for the companies of actors who visited Rouen could not have transported any of their stage properties with them, since these belonged to the owners of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and were leased only with that theater. The scenery which the actors used on their tours was undoubtedly reduced to the smallest dimensions possible, and probably depended largely on the indulgent fancy of their audiences, who would gladly put up with a mere indication for the sake of the play. So that it is to be supposed—as Rigal does—that the less spectacular plays were alone given in the provinces, and that it is there and not in Paris that the beginnings of the classical theater are to be found. Corneille, of course, had visited the capital before he composed his first play, and must have attended performances at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. His evident familiarity, too, with the comedies of Latin antiquity may have suggested a more regular place of action than the example of Hardy and the Parisian playwrights could have afforded him.

However this may be, he himself states in the "Examen" to *Mélite* that it was his "common sense" which made him discover unity of action, and gave him an "aversion for that license which puts Paris, Rome and Constantinople on the same stage." Consequently he limited the localities in *Mélite* to the area of one town, Paris. But in *Citandre*, which was written to please the old theatergoers who had found *Mélite* too simple and unemotional, the multiplex decoration is taken advantage of, and the stage is a king's castle with forests adjoining, as in the tragi-comedies of Hardy. Still Corneille yields even here to one requirement of the new school, and re-

stricts the time of the action to twenty-four hours.

The influence of Horace and his *Ars poetica*, now began to assert itself, and in *la Veuve* the dramatist returns to the order of *Mélie* so far as it affected the place, and tries a new idea of his own to satisfy the demands for unity of time. In the preface to *la Veuve* he claims that he always "observes inviolate" unity of place and action. As for the first he says:

"tantôt je la resserre à la seule grandeur du théâtre, et tantôt je l'étends jusqu'à toute une ville, comme en cette pièce. Je l'ai poussé dans le *Clitandre* jusques aux lieux où l'on peut aller dans les vingt et quatre heures; mais bien que j'en pusse trouver de bons garants et de grands exemples dans les vieux et nouveaux siècles, j'estime qu'il n'est que meilleur de se passer de leur imitation en ce point."

And he promises some day to consider the question more at length. His invention for unity of time was a day to each act, or five days for the whole play. This is a compromise, as he states, between the rules of the purists and the freedom of the French stage. It is possible he already had in mind some idea of inventing a middle term for unity of place also.

The preface of *la Veuve* was printed in March, 1634. The next play of Corneille, *la Galerie du Palais*, was not edited until February, 1637, and its preface (a dedication) makes no comments on its construction. Yet so far as unity of time is concerned it continues the idea of a day for each act. For place there are two localities. The one temporary and probably occupying the whole stage at first, the other more permanent and consisting of a street bordered by houses, in which some of the female characters lived. All came into the street to carry on their dialogue, a proceeding not relished by the poet, but necessary, as he writes in the "Examen" of 1660, "pour trouver cette rigoureuse unité de lieu qu'exigent les grands réguliers." The first decoration appears for a while at the end of the fourth act.

*La Suivante*, which followed *la Galerie du Palais*, probably in the season of 1633-34, yet was not published until the quarrel of *le*

*Cid* was at its height, observed both the unities of time and place in the sense of the critics, though Corneille protested against them in his dedication of 1637, and in 1660 in his "Examen," claims that what his actors speak in the street would be better said in their houses which border the street on either side. Still he was evidently satisfied with this kind of unity in 1634, though in the next play, *la Place Royale*, he finds himself forced to modify it by putting his heroine in her own chamber during one soliloquy. The multiplex decoration would easily admit of this, and involved no moving of scenery.

When our author, after this series of successful comedies, was ready to try his Muse in higher flights, and test his powers as a tragic writer, he still disagreed with the ancients to a slight extent and infringed on strict unity of place. He confesses in the "Examen" to *Médée* that he could not bring himself to Seneca's standard in this particular, but makes the heroine of the piece prepare her enchantments in her own room. Another character he puts in prison, only to regret it later on, and affirm that guards would have answered the same purpose much better. So it is evident that the multiplex scenery was made use of again here just as in *la Place Royale*. The next play, *l'Illusion comique*, is known to have been performed with the stage setting in vogue at the time, for the register of the machinist, who prepared the decorations for it, has been preserved. A significant passage in his directions is where "carcans ou menottes" are required. These appliances must refer to the seventh scene of the fourth act, where the text reads *CLINDOR en prison*, and would go to prove that Corneille here employed the symbol for the reality, doing away with the actual prison for the same reasons, perhaps, which he afterwards advanced in the "Examen" to *Médée*.

*L'Illusion comique* was performed by the actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, and very likely in the same season which saw *Médée* given by Mondory and his associates. If this is so, then a year and a half must have elapsed before Corneille tried the stage again with the production of *le Cid*. Such an interval seems more probable than the com-



monly received one of a few months, since not only the verse and language of *le Cid* reveal most careful study on the part of its author, but also because the difficulties attending its construction and adaptation to French dramatic standards, could have been surmounted only after many trials and much self-criticism. The comedians, too, seem to have been aware of the importance of the venture, for the enemies of Corneille, in the dispute which followed the successful performance of the play, claim that the acting and the handsome clothes of the actors were the chief factors in the fame it attained. Unusual efforts had been made, at all events, to have the theatrical properties of *le Cid* everything that could be desired. This care affords another proof of the weight Corneille himself attached to his new departure.

The amount of time spent in elaborating the piece leaves nowhere so clear a trace as in its observance, or non-observance, of the unities. A comparison of *le Cid* with its source is all that is necessary for absolute conviction on this point. The publicity given to the part of the Infanta in the French play, with the evident purpose of eulogizing the hero, interrupts its action, if it does not destroy its unity; while the transformation of the mad prince Sancho into a mere suitor for the heroine's hand, thus making him a counterpart to the Infanta, could have been the outcome only of mature deliberation. To attain unity of time, it was necessary also to reduce the events of three years to the limits of twenty-four hours. Corneille accomplished this feat to his own discomfiture, as he afterwards admits. Yet the final result could not have been reached until after many unsatisfactory trials. In other words, the whole make-up of the play as well as the final preparation of the actors, would indicate a much longer period of inception than the few months generally assigned to it, and for these reasons the date of *l'Illusion comique* may be better placed in the season 1634-35, than in the winter following.

The same care must have attended the setting of the play which was shown in its action and duration. The original drama of Guillen de Castro used all Spain for its theater. Cor-

neille's play was confined to the territory of one town, and evidently to the neighborhood of one street or square. But here the contemporaries have handed down a word of warning. Scudéry complains in his *Observations*:

"disons encore que le théâtre en est si mal entendu, qu'un même lieu représentant l'appartement du Roi, celui de l'Infante, la maison de Chimène et la rue, presque sans changer de face, le spectateur ne sait le plus souvent où sont les acteurs."

The Academy agrees in this criticism, while admitting that the defect is not a new one:

"Quant au théâtre, il n'y a personne à qui il ne soit évident qu'il est mal entendu dans ce poème, et qu'une même scène y représente plusieurs lieux. Il est vrai que c'est un défaut que l'on trouve en la plupart de nos poèmes dramatiques, et auquel il semble que la négligence des poètes ait accoutumé les spectateurs. Mais l'auteur de celui-ci, s'étant mis si à l'étroit pour y faire rencontrer l'unité du jour, devait bien aussi s'efforcer d'y faire rencontrer celle du lieu, qui est bien autant nécessaire que l'autre, et faute d'être observée avec soin, produit dans l'esprit des spectateurs autant ou plus de confusion et d'obscurité."

The meaning of these criticisms is obvious, and so far as the spectator could see, it is clear that the action of *le Cid* was carried on in one place. Rigal has explained this effect (*Alexandre Hardy*, p. 206) by supposing that the multiplex decoration was used, without any distinct divisions among the different pieces of scenery, or any attention being paid to them by the actors, who would all stand on the same spot. This explanation seems to be the correct one and, so far as the last half of it is concerned, is borne out by Mondory's letter to Balzac dated the eighteenth of January, 1637, not many days after the first performance of the play:

"La foule a été si grande à nos portes, et notre lieu s'est trouvé si petit, que les recoins du théâtre qui servaient les autres fois comme de niches aux pages, ont été des places de faveur pour les cordons bleus, et la scène y a été d'ordinaire parée de croix de chevaliers de l'ordre."

Of course under such circumstances unity of place, except so far as the background might change, was unavoidable; and the fact that the comedians allowed their stage to be so

encroached upon, shows that their desire to do all they could for the success of *le Cid* was not heightened by any novelties in the way of scenery. We have seen Corneille approaching this notion of the place of action in his previous plays, though hesitating, as in *la Place Royale* and *Médée*, to entirely adopt it.

What was unusual in *le Cid* was the position of the actors in the middle of the stage, whatever might be the spot where they were supposed to be. The scenery, therefore, must have been based on the multiplex model, for Scudéry's "sans changer de face" was a technical term for different compartments in the same decoration, and does not signify a change between scenes or acts.—The strictures of the Academy also point unmistakably to the multiplex decoration.—Consequently we are to suppose that Corneille wished to carry to its logical conclusion what he had already attempted, and had designated his places by separate buildings, grouped around an open space, into which the characters came, through the doors opening out of each particular structure. It was not a new idea at all; but it was an improbable one in such a combination of passions and events as *le Cid*. Corneille in his "Examen" alludes to the trouble which his place of action made for him and adds:

"Tout s'y passe donc dans Séville, et garde ainsi quelque espèce d'unité de lieu en général; mais le lieu particulier change de scène en scène, et tantôt c'est le palais du Roi, tantôt l'appartement de l'Infante, tantôt la maison de Chimène, et tantôt une rue ou place publique. On le détermine aisément pour les scènes détachées; mais pour celles qui ont leur liaison ensemble, comme les quatre dernières du premier acte, il est malaisé d'en choisir un qui convienne à toutes."

To escape this ambiguity he thinks that the spectators should "help the scenery," and suppose people walking who are standing still, or that a character (Don Diègue, for instance) has entered his house while he is still at the same place on the stage as before. The funeral rites of the Count demanded another stretch of the fancy, another "poetic fiction," and the dramatist, uncertain what to do with so puzzling a question, admits:

"J'ai cru plus à propos de les dérober à son (the spectator's) imagination par mon silence, aussi bien que le lieu précis de ces quatre

scènes du premier acte dont je viens de parler; et je m'assure que cet artifice m'a si bien réussi, que peu de personnes ont pris garde à l'un ni à l'autre, etc."

In the *Discours des Trois Unités*, which was printed in 1660, at the same time as this "Examen," Corneille discusses unity of place at length. He still affirms that the limits of one town suffice to make that unity, and that the stage could very well represent two or three places within the city walls. In citing instances from his plays he says of *le Cid*:

"comme la liaison de scènes n'y est pas gardée, le théâtre, dès le premier acte, est la maison de Chimène, l'appartement de l'Infante dans le palais du Roi, et la place publique; le second y ajoute la chambre du Roi; et sans doute il y a quelque excès dans cette licence."

To rectify such indefiniteness he suggests one of two things: either that changes of place should occur only between acts, as in *Cinna*, or that

"ces deux lieux n'eussent point besoin de diverses décorations, et qu'aucun des deux ne fût jamais nommé, mais seulement le lieu général où tous les deux sont compris, comme Paris, Rome, etc."

In that way the spectator, not having before him different scenery, would not be aware of a change of place on the part of the characters. But when two persons appear in the same act, who are so antagonistic to each other that the auditor's oblivion of the surroundings is not probable, Corneille proposes a compromise, by "theatrical fictions," which would make the place of action no particular room,

"mais une salle sur laquelle ouvrent ces divers appartements, à qui j'attribuerais deux privilèges: l'un que chacun de ceux qui y parleraient fût présumé y parler avec le même secret que s'il était dans sa chambre; l'autre, qu'au lieu que dans l'ordre commun il est quelque fois de la bienséance que ceux qui occupent le théâtre aillent trouver ceux qui sont dans leur cabinet pour parler à eux, ceux-ci pussent les venir trouver sur le théâtre, sans choquer cette bienséance, afin de conserver l'unité de lieu et la liaison des scènes."

Unless this compromise be admitted, Corneille confesses that he had observed, previous to 1660, unity of place in but three tragedies, *Horace*, *Polyeucte* and *Pompée*.

The conclusion of the whole matter would be, then, that in *le Cid* Corneille had attempted



a fusion of the old and new, a compromise between the requirements of the purists and the freedom of Hardy's scenery, just as in *la Veuve* he had invented a middle term for the unity of time. But he was forced to give up the former as he had been obliged to yield the latter. Compromises were not in favor in his day, and are in fact but seldom met with in the annals of French history or literature. The spectator recognized in *le Cid* the fixed, multiplex decoration, not necessarily indefinite as Rigal supposes, otherwise Scudéry could hardly have written "presque sans changer de face," or the Academy have ranked it with the majority of the plays of the time. But instead of remaining within the various rooms bordering on the central open space, as in *Médée* and *la Place Royale*, or delaying on the thresholds, as in many of the scenes of Corneille's early comedies, the characters in *le Cid* came entirely away from their respective abiding-places and stood in the middle of the stage. Thus it may be easily explained why the last four scenes of the first act were indefinite in locality, as Corneille himself acknowledges. For these were connected by the characters of each speaking to one another, while the first scenes were separated from one another and from the following four by their entire lack of such communication. In the first two scenes of the original play the open square was the real place of the action, but in the third scene it was the assumed place, the Infanta and her attendants evidently coming thither from the door of her apartment (note the stage direction for line 61, *Le Page rentre*). Besides, the presence of a part of the audience on the sides of the stage forces us to allow that all the dialogue was carried on in the middle, while Corneille's admission that the four last scenes of the first act were indefinite in locality would indicate that he considered the first three definite. The only way this definiteness could be gained would be by the actors advancing from the buildings where they were supposed to be—as the dramatist had conceded in his previous plays and as he argued for in the *Discours des Trois Unités*. And this they must have done in the disconnected scenes of *le Cid*, while in those which were joined more closely together, one actor re-

mained in the square and the others came to him.

Here is the "theatrical fiction," a unity of place which satisfied neither the crowd, fond of spectacular effects, nor the strict disciples of Aristotle and Horace. And so it had to go the way Corneille's compromise for unity of time had gone. The outcome of the struggle was the banishment of general subjects from the classical stage of France. The scenery of *le Cid*, as Corneille planned it, would have seemed narrow and hesitating to the most indulgent of romanticists, yet it was still too varied for the Academy and the Hôtel de Rambouillet. Accordingly its author was forced to his last concession to their demands, and "Le théâtre est une chambre à quatre portes. Il faut un fauteuil pour le roi" (stage register of 1673), was the final realization of Corneille's words in the *Discours des Trois Unités*, of 1660.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

#### GERMAN LOAN-WORDS AND THE SECOND SOUND SHIFTING.

It is well established that at different times, from the beginning of the O.H.G. period up to the late Middle Ages, certain consonant changes have taken place in the Upper German dialects. These changes are collectively known as the Second Sound Shifting, although not all consonants have permuted simultaneously throughout the whole linguistic area. It is rightly assumed that barring peculiar irreducible consonant groups and crossing influences, this change took place uniformly within the whole language, and that Modern High German represents the group of the Second Sound Shifting.\*

German philologists are accustomed to subject loan-words to the test of native words and to judge of the approximate age of their introduction by the manner in which the permutations have taken place. They seem to forget that what is true of changes within the language is not *eo ipso* true of changes in newcomers whose foreign garb marks them as belonging to a special class. As far as I

\*This is not the common view. H. C. G. v. J.

know, no one has as yet attempted to investigate German loan-words properly, for Kluge's etymologies cannot be regarded in this light. His method of putting foreign words to the test of the sound mutation leads him to some strange and amusing results.

Kluge<sup>1</sup> regards the affricata *pf* as the surest sign of an early borrowing, and to this *pf* we we shall mainly devote our attention. Under *Pfalz* we find: "As the permutation of L.G. *p* to H.G. *pf* indicates, the word must have been naturalized in G. as early as the beginning of the eighth century." Hence he argues that *Pfahl*, *Pfosten*, *Pflanze* had been introduced before the O.H.G. period. But it cannot be denied that the same O.H.G. has the words *Paar*, *Pacht*, *Palme*, *Pech*, *Petersilie* and many other words with unmutated *p*, and there is no reason to think that these are of a younger date than the former. Under *Treppe* he gives a form *Trepfe* for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Are we to suppose two distinct borrowings from the North for it, one before and one after these two centuries? And how did the sound all of a sudden shift so late? Under *Pforte* we find: "Borrowed in the O.H.G. period in the eighth century, from Latin *porta* hence the absence of the permutation of *t* to *z*, which had been accomplished even in the seventh century." But we have learned above that the change to *pf* had been accomplished before the beginning of the eighth century, so there is left only the uncomfortably narrow limit between the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century, in which to slip *porta* into the language.

And now, since *t* has changed to *z* before the seventh century, Kluge places *Ziegel* in the fifth or sixth century. *Tafel*, says he, is borrowed in the O.H.G. period, *Zabel*, of course, to suit his theory, is older than O.H.G. But what reason is there to suppose that *Ziegel* like all other architectural terms is older than *Turn*, O. H. G. *turri*, *turra*? And what are we to do with *Ketzer* from *καθαρὸς* in the eleventh century (*h* at that time could have come in only through the medium of Latin *th*

<sup>1</sup> Kluge's *Etymological Dictionary*, fourth edition, London, 1891. Since writing this I have consulted the fifth edition; there is no improvement there in the treatment of loan-words.

or *t*), which shows a shifting at such a late time?

Words introduced by the Church into Germany, Kluge says, show no mutation; yet Christianity was known and generally accepted in Upper Germany long before the eighth century, before *p* had gone over to *pf*, and he can adduce no good reason why *Pfaffe* should be older than *Papst* and *Pfarrer* than *predigen*.

These few examples illustrate the improper treatment of loan-words. The first mistake made by philologists in dealing with them arises from a misconception of the manner in which sound changes take place and perpetuate themselves. Winteler<sup>2</sup> says by implication that Upper German consonantism differs from Northern consonantism in that it distinguishes quantity of explosive sounds and not quality: *b* and *p*, *g* and *k*, *d* and *t* differ only by a greater or lesser pressure of the respective organs, and are all voiceless. H.G. *p*, *k*, *t*, when used in words which the Swiss hear for the first time are reproduced by them in an aspirated or affricated form, namely *ph*, *kh* or *kx*, *th*. The main features of the second sound shifting are greatly due to this U.G. aspiration. This, doubtless, has been a characteristic of U. G. speech upwards of ten centuries, and the O.H.G. and M.H.G. graphic signs *ph*, *ch*, *th* merely mark the first steps towards a stronger enunciation resulting in affricatae in two of the three sounds. *The second sound shifting owes its origin primarily to a particular locality and a particular people, not to a particular time.* At a later time, when the art of writing becomes general, this native change may be retarded and it may even retrograde, but of this I shall speak later. This affrication is going on to-day as much as in the time of the Carolingians, and will go on, as long as books and a closer intercourse with the learned do not exert a corrective influence.

Before entering upon a further discussion of the Germanic sound shifting, I shall illustrate the working and persistency of sound substitution in some Russian loan-words. In Russian as well as other Slavic idioms, *f* exists

<sup>2</sup> J. Winteler, "Die Kerenzer Mundart des Kantons Glarus in ihren Grundzügen dargestellt." 1876.



only in foreign words. In native words the voiced dento-labial spirant frequently becomes voiceless before consonants and finally, so that in reality *f* is not an impossible sound to a Russian. Ever since the introduction of Christianity, Greek *θ* has been pronounced as *f* in Russian, hence *Afiny*, *Korinf*, *Fomá* (Thomas). And even to-day a Slav's first attempt to pronounce *I think* is sure to result in *I fink*. In White Russian, *f* is preserved in all such foreign words as the White Russian continually hears pronounced by Germans and Poles living in his midst, but he invariably at first hearing will change all his *f*'s of foreign words to *χv* or even *χ*. So, while we find in W. Russian *fura*, *figura*, *fefer*, *sal's*, other foreign words *fon*, e.g. *ar fest*, *fortuna*, *far-tuk*, *oficér* become *χvonar*, *χvest*, *χvortuna*, *χvar-tuk*, *αχvicér*; and the Graeco-Russian names *Θeodosij*, *Θeodor* become *Xvedós*, *Xvjódor* or even *Xadós*, *Xadór*. Now *χv* has been for many centuries a distinctive Russian combination, and in two out of six O. Slavonic words with initial *χv* recorded by Miklosich, Russian influence is suspected.<sup>3</sup> We see here a process of sound mutation in operation for many centuries and one not likely soon to cease.

In Silesian dialects the initial affricata *pf* has advanced to simple *f*, while medial and final *pf* or *f* have retrograded to *p*,<sup>4</sup> but owing to book influence *pf* is still felt as a legitimate correspondent to L.G. or foreign *p*;<sup>5</sup> hence we find the forms *Supfe*, *Trepfe*, *Klapfer*, *Klumpfen*, and what is still stranger, Polish *pieniądze* has undergone sound shifting and has become *Phinunse*.<sup>6</sup> Another example of aspiration is *Tóbach* for *Tabak*,<sup>7</sup> which is certainly a modern word. More frequently, however, the

<sup>3</sup> Franz Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen*, I, 239.

<sup>4</sup> Karl Weinhold, *Ueber deutsche Dialectforschung*, etc., p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Meines wissens wird nur (ausz religiöser Scheu) in Schepfer creator das *pf* rein gesprochen; das gefüz zum schepfen heiszt Schepper. Formen wie Supfe, Trepfe sind wol ausz missverständener Sucht recht rein zu sprechen zu deuten, oder sind sie die streng hochdeutschen Formen?

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 74. Das polnische Wort *pieniądze* Geld (ausz dem deutschen Pfénning entlehnt) hat bei der Rückaufnahme in das deutschschlesische die Lautverschiebung ergriffen: *Phinunse* (Trebnitz).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 85.

reverse process of softening has taken place in consequence of the checking influence of books.<sup>8</sup>

In the Kerenz dialect initial *pf* corresponds to U.G. *pf*.<sup>9</sup> Loanwords introduced through modern German change their initial *p* to *ph*, while those that came in through M.H.G. (book-language) show unmutated *p* or even *b*. Now *ph* is the nearest approach to *pf*: *Phak* Pack, *phur* pur, *Phersu* Person, *Phauli* Paul, "ein in Bauernfamilien noch fremder Name."<sup>10</sup> So, too, Gothic *k* has become *x*, while M.H. G. *k* invariably sounds *kx* (*kχ*), and in other Swiss dialects *kx* corresponds to organic Gothic *k*.<sup>11</sup>

When we say that in Upper German the permutation *pf* for *p* was accomplished in the seventh century, we merely mean that it was then universally accomplished for native words, but the change in newly introduced foreign words may take place for many centuries later and is not excluded even to-day in cases where book influence is not possible.

Another error is to suppose that all foreign words adopted before the seventh century must have undergone the soundchange together with native words. If the origin of the word is not transparent and it offers no strange combinations, then naturally it is subjected to the same treatment as German words. The word, however, may have originated in Latin

<sup>8</sup> The softening of *p* to *b*, *k* to *g*, *t* to *d*, so common in M.H.G., and the reverse process of hardening no doubt arise from the absence of a quantitative difference between the mediae and tenues in the Upper German dialects. While the sandhi rules of Notker's canon may have had sound foundation in actual differentiation, yet on the whole the interchange of mediae with tenues or, to speak with Winteler, of fortes with lenes is rather arbitrary in M.H.G. The Silesian dialects distinguish between mediae and tenues, but evidently owing to book influence foreign words appear in the M.H.G. form. "Diese Neigung des deutschen, fremde Labialtenues zu erweichen, wo sie nicht aspiriert wurde, erscheint bekanntlich mhd. in ausgedehnter Weise." Weinhold, *ibid.* p. 72.

<sup>9</sup> J. Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 44.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 56. In Uebereinstimmung mit dem mhd. erscheint *b* für welsches *p*, meist im Anlaut, z. B.: *balme*, etc. .... doch haben andere die Fortis behalten, z. B. *par* .... während noch andere, offenbar durch das hochdeutsche vermittelte, die Aspirata aufweisen.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 50 and 52. A curious case of a loss of a supposed U.G. sound mutation is seen in G. *Zins*, Latin *census*, which in O. Saxon became *tins*.

books and its origin may long be present in the mind of the speaker, or it may be a Romance word for some commodity or luxury accessible only to the upper classes, who are aware of its foreign origin or even are conversant with the foreign language. In this case a word may withstand the sound shifting for an indefinite time, or, at some later time, it may become the common property of the lower classes and it may undergo the sound change.

Words referring to Church and religion form a large group of book words whose Latin origin was continually before the eyes of priests and communicants, and it is not to be wondered at that *Priester, Papst, Dom, Pein, Plage, predigen, Kreuz, Altar* should show no sound shifting, and yet we find *phine, pflige, pflöge* (Lexer). Where, however, the corrective of the Latin book language was absent and the word was diffused among the masses, the sound change could have taken place even at a later period. There is no reason to doubt the origin of *Pfaffe* from Middle Latin *papa* and *Pfarre* from *parrochia*. What Kluge gives under *Pfaffe* is no proof at all of Greek influence in the German Church. Greek *παπᾱς* is first mentioned in the fourth Œcumenical Council (A. D. 451);<sup>12</sup> in the following centuries it occurs in the plural form *papades* in the Roman church and not before we reach the twelfth or the thirteenth century does *papa* become general in the sense of *clericus*.<sup>13</sup> As this word is not found in books of prayer or ritual, it is natural that it should become the full possession of the people in a true Germanic form. Precisely the same is to be said of *parrochia*<sup>14</sup> which being also a Greek word be-

<sup>12</sup> E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. He gives also *παπᾱς* as an equivalent for *παπᾱς*; and since a corresponding word for *clericus* does not occur in the Romance languages, the possibility of *Pfaffe* being merely a popular form of *Papst* is not excluded.

<sup>13</sup> To judge from Du Cange, the word was first introduced into the Roman church by pope Zacharias who was by birth a Greek (eighth century). The nearest examples following this first quotation are all from bulls and chartularies of the time of Innocent iii (end of twelfth century).

<sup>14</sup> Du Cange gives *parofia* as a variation for Middle Latin *parochiad*, and we find this in the form *parafia* as the common word for parish in Polish, and *paropi parofia parrofia parrofi parofi perofia* in the Provençal dialects (Mistral). No

came Latinized at a relatively late time; not being found in the Bible and the prayerbook there was nothing in its way of becoming naturalized. Kluge objects to the loss of the last syllable, but such losses are not rare in German.

So it is by no means strange that *Teppich* should show no sound changes although it is found already in the O.H.G. period. Yet it would have been but fair for Kluge to quote Lexer *in toto* and not to avoid forms which would work against his pet theory of precisely locating the borrowing of a word. Now we find the forms *tepit teppit teppet tept tepich teppich tepech tepech tepch deppich tebich tewich töppich teppit tapit tapet tapeiz* and last not least *zeppet*.<sup>15</sup> So after all a partial sound change occurs, and Kluge would be compelled to place the origin of the word before the seventh instead of into the eighth century. But it is really immaterial what the form of the word is, for the different approximations found in M.H.G. are precisely what we should expect without being driven to as many new derivations as there are forms.

The Germans are supposed to have borrowed a number of architectural terms from the Romans, and if there is any structural form with which the Germans were acquainted earlier than any other it is certainly the tower, the Lat. *turris*. And yet this word has persisted as *turri, turra* in O.H.G., *turm, turn* in M.H.G. and Mod.H.G. What is Kluge to do with this obstinacy? He simply passes it over in silence. As a matter of course, the Latin word stayed with them as an ever present reminder of Roman power and is no doubt as old as *Tiegel, Pfahl* and *Pfosten*.

doubt *parofia* existed in M.H.G. and it is this form that must have given rise to M.H.G. *pharrhof* (see Lexer, *pharrehof*) in which there is an attempt at popular etymology and which means no more and no less than merely *pfarre*. Now *pfarre* must naturally result out of this combination. This becomes more probable when we consider the other popular etymology *pharreherre* for *pharraere* by the side of it: "ausdeutend entsteht aus *pharraere*, Wack." (Lexer).

<sup>15</sup> Here are a few more examples from Lexer: *panzier panzer* . . . im 16, jh. bei Erasim, Alberus auch lautverschoben *psanzer*; *pär par* . . . *phar*; *patène patèn phatene phaten*; *phahte phaht, md, phacht pacht phät packt*; *phlanzen planzen(!)*; *pfläge pfläge pflöge*; *tambär tambäre tantär tabär tapär t. mbur tamber zambär(!)*; *timit dimit zimit*. We certainly could not regard *zambär*, from French *tambour* as introduced before the seventh century.



The tendency of ascribing culture and cultivation of plants to Rome, I am afraid, has gone too far. De Candolle shows conclusively that certain kinds of plums<sup>16</sup> are indigenous to the central European plain, and that the cherry<sup>17</sup> and the pear<sup>18</sup> had been cultivated in Germany from time immemorial. We should not assume a Roman origin except where it can be proved historically that the first importation came from Italy. A coincidence of sounds with the serviceable second sound shifting can at best be only adduced as a proof of common possession.<sup>19</sup>

Although *Pfirsich* exhibits the permutations completely it is very doubtful whether it was known in Germany before the M.H.G. period, and its absence from O.H.G. is not at all so strange. The earliest example in Littré under *pêche* is of the thirteenth century and the English *peach* shows that it is a late French importation. *Rettig*, according to Kluge, comes directly from Latin *radicem* before the O.H.G. period on account of its final guttural. As a matter of fact *radix* received the particular meaning of *raphanus* on French soil, as *raditz rais*, etc., in Provençal and *radis* in French indicate, hence it is more likely that the radish became known as an edible root from France. Altogether French importations have been placed by several centuries too late, and many of the southern fruits were more likely introduced from France, such as the fig, the peach.<sup>20</sup>

The Spanish boot of the second sound shifting has been rigorously applied by Kluge to the ending of words and with disastrous results. When a foreign word is introduced into the native language with a different sound

<sup>16</sup> Alph. de Candolle, *Origine des Plantes Cultivées*, p. 170.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p. 183.

<sup>19</sup> Even if the word be taken from Latin there is not sufficient ground to assume an importation of the plant from Rome. The horseradish is known throughout Germany as *Meerrettig*, but in some parts of Austria the Slavic form *Kren* has survived. This in itself is not a proof that the plant has been imported from Russia.

<sup>20</sup> It will be noticed that *Feige*, *Dattel*, *Zwiebel* resemble much more the French words *figue*, *datte* (Italian *dattilo*), *ciboule* than Latin *ficus*, *dactylus*, *caepulla*. The latter would have given quite different results.

system, the tendency will be to so transform it as to give it a native appearance. The sound mutation is a powerful agent in this direction, but it affects only the first part of the word which in German corresponds to the accented root syllable of the word.<sup>21</sup> In the following unaccented syllables the sound mutation according to the strict law does not always produce the desired effect, and more convenient transformations which follow the law of least resistance take place. Strange syllables receive the native garb, and dialectically *patata* becomes *Patak*,<sup>22</sup> *Appetit* *Apetik*<sup>23</sup> and *Tabak* *Tóbach*.<sup>24</sup> The more a word becomes the possession of the people at large the greater the change must be if it departs too much from the native form.

For the change of endings native syllabic combinations must be kept in mind. The M.H.G. and Mod.H.G. *-ig-ich* (*ch* after liquids) is a syllable of least resistance, and foreign *-ic -it -ec -et -ac -at -j* etc., are liable to take this ending, hence such forms as *Rettig* *Pfirsich* *Essig* *Mönch* *Kelch* *Teppich* *predigen* *Käfig*.<sup>25</sup>

Unusual combinations may be transformed. The change of *turr* to *Turn* (: *Sturm*, *Wurm*) is such an instance. Frequently all the changes combined are not sufficient to produce the desired result, and then popular etymology comes into play and still further transforms the combination. Such attempts are seen for example in M.H.G. *pforzich* which we find as *phorzeich* *vörzich* *forzaichen* *furzog*.

When we deal with loan-words in modern German, all these facts must be considered. Besides, as often is the case, peculiar dialectic forms may survive, and it is not necessary to resort to the second sound shifting to locate the word. Phonetic studies are not the end of etymological investigation of these words but merely an assistance in the chronological data of sources. Loan-words must mainly be stud-

<sup>21</sup> Hence generally the accent is drawn back to the first syllable.

<sup>22</sup> Kluge, *Etym. Dictionary* sub *Kartoffel*.

<sup>23</sup> Winteler, *Die Kerenzer Mundart*, p. 56.

<sup>24</sup> Weinhold, *Ueber deutsche Dialektforschung*, p. 85.

<sup>25</sup> Other M.H.G. words are: *prisilig* for *prisilje*, 'brasilienholz,' *bederich* for *pheteraere* 'petraria;' *phorzeich* *phorzeich*, 'porticus.'

ied historically and the second sound shifting must not be juggled with.

LEO WIENER.

Missouri State University.

### JUBINAL'S "ÉVANGILE AUX FEMMES."

IN 1835 Achille Jubinal published a book entitled: *Jongleurs et Trouvères, ou Choix de Saluts, Épîtres, Réveries et autres pièces légères des XIIIe et XIVe siècles*. Among the poems here published was the "Évangile aux Femmes" (pp. 26-33), which was known to him to exist in three MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. In the following pages will be noticed the manner in which he used these three MSS.: A, B and C, in the constitution of his text.

A contains thirty-three quatrains, B sixteen quatrains, and C thirty-two quatrains. The text of A he disregarded almost altogether, leaving twelve of its quatrains unpublished, and made C the basis of his text, though pretending to follow the others (at least in regard to the order of quatrains).

Since the quatrains occur in a different order in each of the MSS., the editor chose to follow in the main the order of C; but as he considered B to have the best text, he followed B's text whenever a quatrain was contained in B. When he came near the end of the poem he noticed that several quatrains which occur in B are not to be found in C, so he inserted these quatrains here and there among those of C. He seems to have made use of A only eight times: the first time by putting the first quatrain of A in place of the third quatrain of C to which it corresponds; five times by substituting a word from A which seemed to make better sense; and twice by giving in a footnote a quatrain not found in either of the other two MSS.

A point to be noted in regard to his use of A is that in five cases he gives a quatrain as occurring in C alone (which he always indicates by an asterisk), whereas it really does occur in A also, although wanting in B. His slighting of A is probably due to the fact of its greater age which made its decipherment more difficult for him.

I have examined Jubinal's text in the light thrown on it by copies of MSS. A and B, and by a part copy, part collation (of Constans' text, *Marie de Compiègne*, 1876) of MS. C. The following is a tabulated statement of the chief results:

#### Jubinal's Sources.

- J<sup>1</sup> = C<sup>1</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>2</sup> = C<sup>2</sup>, putting verse 2 last (AB wanting),
- J<sup>3</sup> = A<sup>1</sup> (C<sup>3</sup>, B<sup>1</sup>),
- J<sup>4</sup> = B<sup>2</sup>, except *traient* from A<sup>2</sup> (C<sup>5</sup>, B<sup>1</sup>),
- J<sup>5</sup> = B<sup>3</sup> (C<sup>4</sup>, A<sup>3</sup>),
- J<sup>6</sup> = C<sup>6</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>7</sup> = C<sup>7</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>8</sup> = C<sup>8</sup> (A<sup>8</sup>, B<sup>8</sup> are somewhat similar),
- J<sup>9</sup> = C<sup>9</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>10</sup> = C<sup>10</sup> (A<sup>30</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>11</sup> = C<sup>11</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>12</sup> = B<sup>4</sup> (C<sup>12</sup>, A<sup>4</sup>),
- J<sup>13</sup> = C<sup>13</sup> (A<sup>16</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>14</sup> = B<sup>5</sup>, except verse 3 from C<sup>14</sup> (C<sup>14</sup>, A<sup>5</sup>),
- J<sup>15</sup> = B<sup>6</sup>, except *cuer* from C<sup>15</sup> (C<sup>15</sup>, A<sup>6</sup>),
- J<sup>16</sup> = B<sup>7</sup>, except *apareille, ausi, pourvoit, c'on, com*, which in spelling follow A<sup>7</sup> (C<sup>16</sup>, A<sup>7</sup>),
- J<sup>17</sup> = C<sup>17</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>18</sup> = C<sup>18</sup> (A<sup>29</sup>, B wanting; verse 1 much changed by Jubinal; marked by him as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>19</sup> = C<sup>19</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>20</sup> = C<sup>20</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>21</sup> = C<sup>21</sup> (A<sup>32</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>22</sup> = B<sup>10</sup> (C<sup>22</sup>, A<sup>10</sup>),
- J<sup>23</sup> = C<sup>23</sup> (A<sup>11</sup>, B wanting; marked by Jubinal as occurring in C alone),
- J<sup>24</sup> = B<sup>11</sup> (C<sup>24</sup>, A<sup>12</sup>),
- J<sup>25</sup> = B<sup>12</sup> (C<sup>25</sup> and A<sup>15</sup> are similar),
- J<sup>26</sup> = B<sup>8</sup> (A<sup>8</sup> and C<sup>8</sup> are similar),
- J<sup>27</sup> = B<sup>9</sup> (C wanting, A<sup>9</sup>),
- J<sup>28</sup> = C<sup>26</sup> (B wanting; A<sup>13</sup> and A<sup>15</sup> are similar),
- J<sup>29</sup> = C<sup>27</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>30</sup> = C<sup>28</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>31</sup> = B<sup>13</sup> (C wanting, A<sup>14</sup>),
- J<sup>32</sup> = B<sup>14</sup> (C wanting, A<sup>17</sup>),
- J<sup>33</sup> = C<sup>29</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>34</sup> = C<sup>30</sup> (AB wanting),
- J<sup>35</sup> = C<sup>31</sup> (AB wanting),

J<sup>36</sup>=B<sup>15</sup> (CA wanting),

J<sup>37</sup>=B<sup>16</sup> (A wanting; C<sup>32</sup>, last two verses are similar and are given in a foot-note by Jubinal).

Added at the end in a note are:

J<sup>38</sup>=A<sup>26</sup> (CB wanting),

J<sup>39</sup>=A<sup>28</sup> (CB wanting).

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.

### THE EARLIEST USE OF THE WORD GEOLOGY.

ANENT the recent inquiry in *Notes and Queries*, Sep. 29, 1894 (see also *id.*, Nov. 24) for the first use of the word *geology*, attention should be directed to the supposed coinage of *geologia* by Richard de Bury.

The passage of the *Philobiblon* in which *geologia* occurs closes the eleventh chapter, which tells "Why we have preferred the books of the Liberal Arts before the books of Law." The argument is thus summed up:

"From these things it is sufficiently clear that as laws are neither arts nor sciences, so the books of law cannot properly be called books of art or science; nor is this faculty to which we give, by an appropriate term, the name *geology*, or the science of earthly things, to be reckoned among the sciences." [*nec est haec facultas inter scientias recensenda, quam licet geologiam appropriato vocabulo nominare.*]

This translation of the passage is taken from the admirable edition of the *Philobiblon* prepared by Professor A. F. West and published by the Grolier Club (New York, 1889).

It is only necessary to add Professor West's comments upon this occurrence of the word *geologia*:

Part iii, p. 30: "De Bury's Greek was slight enough. Greek words are 'exotic' to him, and he handles them delicately. They are not infrequent, however, in his book. He coins *geologia* correctly and *Philobiblon* awkwardly."

Part iii, p. 127: "De Bury coins *geologia*, 'the science of earthly things,' as the appropriate name for law, in antithesis to the sciences which aid in the understanding of divine things—comprehensively speaking, *theologia*."

*Transactions of the Am. Phil. Soc.*, vol. xxii (1891), p. 96: *geologia*.—"The only instance, I suppose, in Latin, previous to modern times. It is coined by De Bury."

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

### BARLAAM AND JOASAPH IN SPAIN.

THE following contribution is intended to be an addition to: Ernst Kuhn, *Barlaam und Joasaph*, Eine bibliographisch-literargeschichtliche Studie. (München, 1893).<sup>1</sup>

I have not exhausted the subject; many works yet to be inspected may contain additional matter.

Kuhn in his work gives:

I Spanish translations of the story:

p. 66. 1. Juan de Arce Solorzano, 1608.

2. Baltasar de Santa Cruz. 1692.

II. Spanish shortened versions of the story:

1. Estoria, ed Lauchert (According to Vincentius Bellovacensis).

p. 67. 2. Ribadeneira, Flos Sanctorum.<sup>2</sup>

III. Literary productions bearing the name of B. and J.:

1. Lope de Vega, Barlan y Josafá.

IV. Literary productions containing the story, but not bearing the name of B. and J.: None mentioned.

V. Spanish versions of the Parables of B. and J.:

A. Of the Parables found in the current text:

p. 74, note. a. Die "Geschichte" (N. B. no real Parable) "von dem Ratgeber des Königs" in Conde Lucanor.<sup>3</sup>

1. "Der Mann im Brunnen:"

p. 76. a. Libro de los Gatos, Cap. 48.<sup>4</sup>

2. "Die drei Freunde":

p. 77. a. Castigos é Documentos del Rey Don Sancho.<sup>5</sup>

b. Conde Lucanor.<sup>6</sup>

c. Historia del Cavallero Cifar, cap.v.<sup>7</sup>

B. Of the additional parables found in the Hebrew version of Ibn Chisdai:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Abh. der k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.* I. Cl., xx. Bd., I. Abth.

<sup>2</sup> The author remarks, after speaking of Ribadeneira "Einen in Buenos Aires gedruckten Spanischen Text sah Kirpičnikov in Paris." I am unable to make out whether this is a complete translation, or a reprint of Rib.

<sup>3</sup> *Riv. Col. Aut. Esp.* vol. li., p. 369.

<sup>4</sup> *Riv. LI.* p. 557. Oesterley (*Fahrh.*, ix, 126,) proves that the L. d. l. G. is a translation of Odo of Ciringtonia.

<sup>5</sup> *Riv. LI.*, p. 157.

<sup>6</sup> *Riv. LI.*, p. 418.

<sup>7</sup> Add: of the first Part, p. 21. Ed. Stutg. Lit. Verein.

<sup>8</sup> *Vide* Kuhn, p. 44, note; p. 43. Cap. xxiv, xxvii.



p. 82.—1. "Die beiden einander vergiftenden Strolchen" in:

- a. *Leyendas Moriscas*, Ed. F. Guillén Robles, I, 173-177.

In the works quoted by Kuhn we find:

I. Spanish Translations of the story:

The *Bulletin de l'Acad. d. Sciences de St. Pétersb.*, Cl. hist.-philol., ix (1852), nos. 20, 21, p. 308 (Kuhn, p. 51, c), quoted and referred to by Cosquin, (Kuhn, p. 4) says: "Unmittelbar aus dem Lateinischen ging sie in das Spanische, gegen Ende des 15. Jahrh. in's Böhmische . . . über."

Does this mean that before the end of the fifteenth Century it was translated into Spanish? If so, no other reference has fallen under my notice, since the text of the library of the Royal Palace at Madrid (see below) is not a translation.<sup>9</sup>

II. Kuhn (p. 55) says:

"Abkürzungen liegen u. a. vor: a. in des Vincentius Bellovacensis *Speculum historiale*, Lib. xv, cap. 1-64. b. in der *Legenda Aurea* oder *Historia Lombardica* des Jacobus de Voragine, cap. 175."

Of the *Legenda Aurea* we find the following Spanish translations:

1. MS. in two vols. folio, Bibl. Nac. B.B., 58-59.

2. MS. in one vol. folio, Bibl. Nac. Q. 2.

Don Antonio Sanchez Moguel (*Mágico Prodigioso*, Madr. 1881, p. 62, says about 1:

"letra del siglo xv, copia de más antiguo texto, á juzgar por su lenguaje, de fines del xiii. ó principios del xiv."

I have compared both 1 and 2 with Bibl. Nac. E. E. 23. (Sanch. Mog., l. c., p. 64), which MS., its oldest *Legenda Aurea*, the Catalogue mentions as "Saec. xiii," and I find them to be literal translations of the Latin MS. Our saints are found in B.B. 59, fol. ccxix, r<sup>o</sup>-ccxxvi, 10.

A Catalan translation of the *Leg. Aur.* is

- 9 Kuhn (p. 54), "um nur einige zu erwähnen," sums up a number of MSS. of the mediaeval Latin translation ascribed (*vid.* p. 53) to Georgius Trapezuntius.

For Spain may be mentioned:

MS. F. 152 of the Madrid Bibl. Nac., xii, cent. (*vid.* A de los Rios, iii, 285, note; F. Wolf, in *Jahrb.* vi, 62, note) which contains, together with a number of works, apparently of French origin, on fol. 124-136: "Vita Beatorum B. and J."

found in the Paris Bibl. Nat. MS. Esp., No. 44.<sup>10</sup>

V. Spanish versions of the Parables. Besides those given by Kuhn, we find in the works quoted by him:

1. "Die erste Doppel parabel von der Todestrompete und den vier Kästchen":

- a. Libro de los Enxemplos, 121,<sup>11</sup> (Oesterley, *Gesta Rom.*, 143).

- b. Libro de los Enx., 223,<sup>12</sup> (Oesterley, *ibid.*, 143).

- c. Timoneda, Alivio<sup>13</sup> (Oesterley, *ibid.*, 251; Brauholtz, *Die erste nicht-christl. Parabel des B. u. J.* p. 53).

2. "Mann und Vogel":

- a. Libro de los Enx., 53<sup>14</sup> (Oesterley, 167)

3. "Mann im Brunnen":

Nothing additional, because Knust (*Jahrb.*, vi, 37) refers us to the Spanish translation of *Calila é Dymna*,<sup>15</sup> which we can leave out of consideration.<sup>16</sup>

4. "Drei Freunde":

Oesterley (129) refers to Petrus Alphonsus ii, 8; *Espejo de Leyos (sic)* 9 and *Ysopo* of 1644, fo 152.

As all these are translations,<sup>17</sup> if they occur in Spanish (I do not know of a Spanish translation of the *Disc. Cler.*), they may be left out of consideration.

5. "Jahreskönig."

Oesterley (74) adds:

- a. Libro de los Enx., 339;<sup>18</sup> and (224):

- b. Conde Lucanor, 49.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Morel Fatio, in *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, ii, 2, p. 91, 101.

<sup>11</sup> Riv. LI, p. 476.

<sup>12</sup> Riv. LI, p. 502.

<sup>13</sup> Riv. vol. iii, p. 173. Repeated almost verbatim in Julian de Medrano, *Silva Curiosa*, Paris, 1608, p. 145. For a collation of the two works see later in MOD. LANG. NOTES.

<sup>14</sup> Riv. LI, p. 460. Like many stories in the *L. d. l. Enx.* it begins: "Dijo Pedro Alfonso a su fijo." In fact, this version is nearer to the *Disciplina Clericalis* than to B. and J.

<sup>15</sup> Riv. LI, p. 18-19.

<sup>16</sup> Landau, *Quellen des Dekameron*<sup>2</sup>, p. 222, mentions *Leg. Aur.*, cap. 117. The Spanish translation has already been mentioned (col. 23).

<sup>17</sup> Gayangos, in Riv. LI, p. 445; Morel Fatio, in *Romania*, Oct. 1894.

<sup>18</sup> P. 529.

<sup>19</sup> P. 420.

c. Libro de los Enx., 310.<sup>20</sup>

6 "Die Liebe zu den Frauen."

D'Ancona, in *Romania*, iii, 168, mentions:

a. Libro de los Enx., 231.<sup>21</sup>

This is all that can be gathered from Kuhn.

I shall add the following:

I. a. Of MS. translations: in Portuguese, that mentioned by C. Michaelis de Vasconcellos in *Grundriss*, ii, 2 p. 212.

I. b. Of printed translations:

1. La vida de Sant Josafat, en lingua Catalana, Comp. por Francisco Alegre. Barcelona, 1494.<sup>22</sup>

2. The translation of 1608 has for complete title:

Historia | de los dos | soldados de | Christo, Barlaan, y Josafat. | Escrita por san Juan Damasceno, Doctor de | la Yglesia Griega. | Dirigida al ilustrissimo y Reuerendissimo don Fr. | Diego de Mardones, Obispo de Cordoua | Confessor de su Magestad, y de su Con- | sejo, &c., mi señor. | En Madrid | En la Imprenta Real M. DC. viii. (small 8<sup>o</sup>. 24 un-numbered pp. of prelim. + 215 fos. text; ends 215, r<sup>o</sup>; v<sup>o</sup>: En Madrid, por Iuan Flamenco.) MDCVIII | Aprov. Sept. 20, 1603. Privil. Febr. 21, 1604. Tassa Mar. 30, 1608.)

In the "Al Letor" the author says:

"Esta tan enriquezida la lengua Latina con las traduciones de la Griega, y las vulgares estrangeras con las de la Latina, que me parecio injusta cosa, que la Española nuestra, siendo tan suaua, copiosa, y no menos elegante, careciesse desta historia."

And later on: "that he made the translation at the age of sixteen," an age at which few Spaniards of that time were able to translate from Greek MSS. The language of this translation is so refreshingly smooth, compared with other works of the same author (*Tragedias de Amor*, Madrid 1607; *Juan de la Cuesta*) that it might be supposed to be directly from the Greek; a comparison with Liebrecht,<sup>23</sup> who points out the differences between the Greek and the version of Billius, shows that the latter was de Arce's original.

<sup>20</sup> P. 521.

<sup>21</sup> P. 504.

<sup>22</sup> Gallardo, *Ensayo de una Biblioteca Espanola*, vol. ii col. 541, no. 3962 of the extract from the Catalogue of Fernando Colón. (Not mentioned by Morel Fatio, *Grundr.*, ii, 2, 91-92). Alegre is mentioned as translator of other works, *Grundr.* ii, 2, 116.

<sup>23</sup> *Vid.* Kuhn, p. 50.

3. In the wretched translation of Fr. Baltasar de Sancta Cruz we find, at the end of the "prologo del traductor al lector":

"Ya a los ultimos pliegos de la impresion llego a mis manos esta misma traduccion impresa en 'Cordoua' por los Años de mill seiscientos y diez y ocho, dedicada al Illustrissimo Señor Obispo de aquella ciudad D. F. Diego Mardones."

This edition, portending to be a reprint of Madrid, 1608, does not exist; Fr. Baltasar's memory was at fault.

II. Shortened versions of the story.

a. A. Morel Fatio (*Romania*. x, p. 300, note) gives a full and correct description of MS. Royal Palace, Madrid, marked 2-G-7 (Old vii-D-5), and having on the back the title: *Leyes de Palencia*. Fol. 300 v<sup>o</sup>. has: *Esriptus fuit anno Domini MCCCCLXX Petrus Ortis*.

The story of B. and J. is found fol. 95-213. From the extracts to be given it will be seen that the author had his own peculiar way of translating. The shortening consists of leaving out part of the wearisome expositions of the Christain faith.

b. Of printed *Flos Sanctorum* in Spanish we find the following:

1. *Legenda seu flos sanctorum in lingua hispanica*. Toledo, 1511.<sup>24</sup>

2. *Flos Sanctorum*, impresso en Zaragoza, año de 1556.<sup>25</sup>

3. *Flos Sanctorum* . . . . Ahora de nuevo corregido . . . por . . . Dr. Gonzalo Millan . . . En Sevilla . . . 1572.<sup>26</sup>

4. <sup>27</sup>La Hagiogra- | phia y vidas de los| Sanctos de el nuevo | Testamento | . . . . Por el Doctor | Joan Basilio Sanctoro. | . . Bilbao, Mathias Mares, 1580.

The *Censura* is dated Febr. 17, 1576.

<sup>24</sup> Catalogue of Colón, no. 2158, in Gallardo, ii, 519.

<sup>25</sup> In *Index Libr. Prohib.*, 1583.

<sup>26</sup> Gallardo, iv, 961, who shows from the work that it was originally written by Fr. Pedro de la Vega, and finished in 1521. (In the Fernandez Guerra Collection).

<sup>27</sup> From this point forward, I no longer refer to Sanchez Moguel, (l. c.) because his statements are incorrect. Of Villegas, the first volume is set down as the complete work: the fifth part, of 1589, is impossible; the differences between early and late Ribadeneyra publications are not indicated; Santoro and Ortiz Lucio are misleading as given, in fact hardly a word is correct. Of Villegas I have not found in San Isidro the third part (Toledo, Juan Rodriguez, 1579.) as given by S. Moguel, p. 164.

Bibl. S. Isidro, 35-4, no. 9698.

The title does not indicate that the work ends, fol. 454, v<sup>o</sup>, with June 30 and: Fin de la Primera Parte.

The *Tabla* does not mention Barlaam; Josaphat is given: Josaphat Rey 27 de Nouiembre. The continuation is not found in S. Isidro.

The "Primera Parte del Flos Sanctorum y vidas de los Santos del Yermo del Nuevo Testamento, por el Dr. I. B. S., Bilbao, 1604," found in said library, ends: "Fin de la Segunda parte," but is the same half redivided into three-monthly parts.

5. Alonso de Villegas.<sup>28</sup>

Salva<sup>29</sup> says:

"De cuán distinto modo pensaba y escribía Villégas en 1554, de lo que pensaba y escribía veinticuatro años más tarde cuando principió á publicar su Flos Sanctorum!"

This gives us 1578 for the date of the first part. The titles of the parts are as follows:

First. Flos Sanctorum y Historia General de la vida y hechos de Iesu Christo . . . y de todos los Santos . . . conforme al breuiario Romano . . . con las vidas de los Santos propios de España, y de otros Extrauagantes . . . En Madrid por Pedro Madrigal: Año M. D. XCIII.

Second. Flos Sanctorum. Segunda Parte y Historta General en que se escriue la vida de la Virgen . . . Tratase de las seys edades del mundo, etc.

[On pp. 215-225, after the building of the Temple and before the life of Joshua, we find: cap. iii en que se escriue el origen de las ordenes militares.]

Third: Flos S. Tercera Parte. Toledo, Juan y Pedro Rodriguez, 1589, contains lives and anecdotes of an endless number of abbots and monks; but nothing about B. and J.

Fourth. Flos S. Cuarta y Ultima Parte, y discursos o sermones sobre los Evangelios de todas las Dominicales del año . . . Madrid, Pedro Madrigal, 1593. (At the end: En Cuenca en casa de Juan Masselin. 1592.)

Fifth. Fructus S. y quinta parte del Flos S. que es libro de exemplos, assi de hombres ilustres en santidad, como de otros cuyos hechos fueron dignos de reprehension y cas-

tigo . . . colegido de historias divinas y humanas. Cuenca, Juan Masselin, 1594.<sup>30</sup>

Touching B. and J. we find: Vol. i. fol. 529, r<sup>o</sup>—sqq: Barlaam, y Josafat, canfessores.

The whole story is given quite fully, but without any vestige of the parables.

Fol v.—This being the most interesting vol. of the whole work I shall describe it somewhat at length, according to a copy in my possession.

On reverse of the title page: extract from Fray Juan de Marieta, *Hist. Ecclesiast. de Esp.*, lib. 20, cap. 70 about the author, containing a list of his works up to 1594, that is, the five parts of F. S. and the life of S. Isidro.

Priv. March 19, 1592; Tassa Dec. 3, 1593; Erratas of work and of Adicion; Portrait of "Alfonsus de Villegas, Tolet, Theol, Vitarum Sanctorum Scriptor, Anni Agens 49," below which comes the remark "Al Lector" that as his *Flos* was being freely reprinted, he had this Portrait made to put it as a signature and mark of authenticity in his own issues. Fol. 2, v<sup>o</sup>-4, r<sup>o</sup>: Prologo al Lector, contains:

"Oso decir, que . . . seria possible aprovecharse mas deste solo, que de las quarto partes que hize del Fl. S., aunque . . . entiendo que han sido muchos aprovechados de aquella lectura: y esto por ser todo de exemplos . . ."

He quotes as follows from a letter of Fr. Luis de Granada, Lisb. 29 Oct. 1588:

"Seria de mucho provecho un libro de exemplos, conforme a otro que anda en Latin, sacado de diversos autores . . . seria una Silva de varia leccion—"

which remark induced him to write this *Fructus*. The work is divided into seventy-eight *Discursos*, arranged alphabetically according to subjects, each introduced by a short exhortation, then follow examples from the Bible, ending: "Hasta aqui es de la divina Escritura;" thereafter examples from religious works and christian history, and winding up with "exemplos estrangeros" from classical literature and an occasional recent event.

<sup>28</sup> F. Wolf in *Wiener Jahrbücher der Literatur*, cxxii, 119 (see Ticknor, transl. by Julius, ii 695) is not accessible to me.

<sup>29</sup> *Catálogo*, 1872, vol. 1, no. 1497, describing the original edition (Toledo, 1554) of the *Comedia Selvagia*.

<sup>30</sup> The set: *Bibl. San Isidro*, 141-2, nos. 49882-86. The sixth part I find mentioned only in *Coleccion de Libros Espanoles Raros o Curiosos* vol. v (Reprint of the *Comedia Selvagia*), Advertencia Preliminar, iv, note. It was finished before 1600.



A great number (169) of the examples are drawn from a book called *Promptuario de Exemplos* or *Guido de exemplis*, which he frequently calls classical, stating that "Guido a tiempos se precia de Vizcayno," and calling him "Guido Bituricense." Guido's book must have been divided into at least three books (131, r<sup>o</sup>), and arranged under headings (430, v<sup>o</sup> he quotes "Prompt. verbo prelati, numero 123").

Furthermore, he mentions (48, r<sup>o</sup>): "Un libro llamado Espejo de exemplos," and (158, r<sup>o</sup>) "un libro de mano de exemplos." A number of these stories also occur in the already quoted *Libro de los Exemplos* published by Gayangos<sup>31</sup> and Morel Fatio,<sup>32</sup> but in very different versions.

The author makes the following remark about his personality (60, r<sup>o</sup>, of addition<sup>33</sup>): "Bernardino de Sandoval, maestrescuela de Toledo, me dio grados de Filosofia y de Teologia." He speaks very feelingly (384, r<sup>o</sup>-v<sup>o</sup>): of the pious prayers of his mother, who even when a widow of seventy years worked silk at her loom as she had done when young and "de mediano estado."<sup>34</sup>

"Una heredad mia de arboleda y cepas bien cerca de la ciudad, en el camino que dizen de Loeches (384, v<sup>o</sup>)," when threatened by locusts, had been kept free by an *agnus dei* which he tied to a tree, "el proprio dia que escrivo esto, que es Domingo diez y seys dias de Junio deste año de mil y quinientos y nouenta y uno."—"Al tiempo que esto se escriue, que es año de 1592." (15, of the first part).

B. and J. are mentioned after San Juan Demasceno: 205, r<sup>o</sup>; 327, r<sup>o</sup>; 335, r<sup>o</sup>; each mention being of only a few lines.

The parable of the love for women, after the *Promptuario*, in two versions, occurs on fol. 335, v<sup>o</sup>.

6. Pedro de Ribadeneyra.

All that can be gathered from Brunet, Graesse, Ebert, Pérennès<sup>34</sup> is dates; Vicente

Lafuente<sup>35</sup> also gives some, but states that vol. i of the *Obras* (1605), has for its contents: *El Flos Sanctorum ó Libro de las Vidas de los Santos de quienes reza la Iglesia Romana todo el año, y los Santos Estrauagantes, en un cuerpo.*

The fact is that vol. ii of 1601, the only one I have been able to see, contains the Saints for the last six months of the year, together with the life of Ignacio de Loyola. B. and J. are not even mentioned here. The edition of 1616 has in the first volume the saints for the whole year, while the second bears the title: "Segunda Parte del F. S. . . En laqual se contienen las vidas demuchos Santos de todos estados, que comunmente llaman Extrauagantes," and contains, besides, the life of Ign. de Loyola. I have not seen vol. i of the *Obras* (1605); vol. ii of 1616 may be a reprint thereof, but has *Licencia*, Feb. 24, 1608; *Privil.* May 1, 1608; *Tassa*, Jan. 29, 1609.

B. and J. are given fo. 481 et seq.; the story is slightly more condensed than in Villegas, but contains the parable about the love of women.<sup>36</sup>

III. Literary works bearing the name of B. and J., or of J. alone. I will add from Barrera's Catalogue:<sup>37</sup>

1. Benjamin de la Iglesia y mártir San Josa-fat (p. 531).

2. Los defensores de Cristo (Barlaan y Josafá, p. 540).

Authors: *Tres Ingenios*—in the volume, Valencia 1646, described by Barr. p. 708, belonging to the University of Bologna.

3. Dos Luceros de Oriente: Barlaan y Josafá (p. 544).

<sup>35</sup> Page xvii of his introduction to R.'s select works, Riv vol LX).

<sup>36</sup> The *Compendio de Vidas de Santos*, por Fr. Francisco Ortiz Lucio, Madrid 1597 (Aprov. Nov. 2, 1595) has not a word about B. and J. Neither do we find their names in Cayrasco's *Templo Militante y Flos S.*, 4 parts, 2 vols.; Lisb., Pedro Crasbeeck, 1613-14. His comical verse (*vid. Sanch. Mog.*, l. c., p. 68-70) might have relieved the monotony of these notes.

<sup>37</sup> Barrera frequently puts down a title without mentioning his authority. The same thing happens in Mesonero Romanos' lists, so that the matter remains as obscure as before. It is to be hoped that in the new edition of Barrera this great inconvenience will be remedied.

<sup>31</sup> Riv. vol. LI.

<sup>32</sup> *Romania*, vol. vii; see *Grundr.*, ii, 2, 95.

<sup>33</sup> After fo. 438, a new foliation 1-60 begins.

<sup>34</sup> *Dict. de Bibliogr. Cathol.* (in Migne, Troisième et dernière encyclopédie théologique).

4. Prodigio de la India, San Josafat<sup>38</sup> (p. 575).

IV. Literary productions containing the story, but not bearing the name of B. and J.<sup>39</sup>

1. Many titles in Barrera's list will lead a person who is occupied with the B. and J. to suspect that they belong to a version of our story. Most of the plays, however, are not to be found; the only one I have succeeded in

Josaphat.  
Abenir su Padre Barba.  
Barachias Galan.  
Teudas Barba.  
Rossa su hixa.  
Fenissa su criada.  
Zardan.  
Pimienta gracioso.  
Un Criado.

At the top of the page as given, there is in more modern handwriting: Barlaam + y Josafat.

The names of the authors, *los Licenciados*, etc. (as in Barrera), are added above the *Personas* by the same hand that wrote the "Barlaam + y Josafat," and in the original hand at the end of the list. Unfortunately the play is not remarkable. A passage that is slightly better than the rest will be given in a future number of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

V. Spanish versions of the Parables. We may add here:

a. The "Geschichte" (as Kuhn calls it) of the adviser of the King which occurs also in

1. Libro de los Enx. 44<sup>o</sup>

<sup>38</sup> On p. xxxii, in Riv. LII (vol. iv of Lope's Selected Works) this play is claimed for Lope by J. R. Chorley, on the authority of Mesonero Romanos (Riv. XLV, vol. ii of *Dramat. Contemp. á Lope*, p. xlix; and Riv. XLIX; vol. ii of *Dramat. posteriores á Lope*, p. xlv).

<sup>39</sup> Amador de los Rios (vol. iv, p. 260, note 2) compares D. Juan Manuel's *Libro de los Estados* with the poem of Perceval. Ferdinand Wolf (*Jahrb.* vol. vi, p. 84, note 2) says: "viel näher liegt der Vergleich mit Barlaam und Josaphat." D. M. Menéndez y Pelayo (*España Moderna*, March 1894, p. 150) says: "D. Juan Manuel presta forma castellana en el Libro de los Estados á la leyenda budista de Barlaam y Josafat." He will show in his introduction to vol. iv of Lope's works that the form D. Juan Manuel chose is closely related to the *Lalita Vistara*.

<sup>40</sup> Riv. li, p. 448.

adding here is: El Principe del desierto y hermitaño de Palacio, by Villanueva Nuñez and José de Luna (Barr. p. 488). The MS. was formerly in the Osuna library; it is now in the Bibl. Nac. The title-page runs:

Comedia famosa | El Principe del desierto y her- | mitaño de Palacio | Personas que hablan en ella:

Barlan viexo.  
Demonio que ha de hazer  
Nacor y celio.  
Tolomeo, Rey de Egipto.  
Porcia su hermana.  
Zafran gracioso.  
Dos Angeles.  
Musica y acompañamient.

2. Libro de los Enx., 215.<sup>41</sup>

b. Another "Geschichte"<sup>42</sup> of the King who sees two poor people living in great contentment, and by the advice of his companion is converted, is found in

1. Libro de los Enx. 288.<sup>43</sup>

c. Still another,<sup>44</sup> of the young man who runs away to keep from marrying a wealthy lady, and later marries a pious old man's pious daughter:

1. Libro de los Enx. 286.<sup>45</sup>

Of the Parables enumerated as such by Kuhn we find:

1. "Todestrompete und Kästchen," in the form given by Braunholtz, according to the *Decamerone* x, i, in Torquemada, *Coloquios satiricos*<sup>46</sup> fos. 12-13.

2. Man and Bird.

1. El cavallero Cifar gives<sup>47</sup> a rather lengthened version; the hunter, not satisfied with the lesson, tries to catch the bird again and loses his life.

<sup>41</sup> P. 499.

<sup>42</sup> Liebrecht, pp. 113-116; he calls it a Parable; I do not give it that name, in order to avoid confusion.

<sup>43</sup> P. 516.

<sup>44</sup> Liebrecht, 117-119, calls it a Parable.

<sup>45</sup> P. 516.

<sup>46</sup> Barrera, p. 397; Salvá i, No. 1452.

<sup>47</sup> P. 180-81, Capit. iv of the *Segunda parte*.



3. The man in the well.

1. Libro de los Gatos, 484<sup>8</sup>

Instead of honey (as in B. and J., *Cal. y Dimn.*; *Leg. Aur.*, etc.) the tree to which the man clings bears apples.

4. The man with his three friends.

All the versions thus far mentioned, have nothing in common with the Story as told in B. and J.<sup>49</sup> They all<sup>50</sup> treat of a son who fancies he has many friends, while his father wonderingly states that he himself has only one,<sup>51</sup> and advises his son to try his friends by pretending that he has killed a man and seeing who will help him. The son is disappointed, but his father's friend is ready immediately to aid him. B. and J. has the Parable of a man who had two very dear friends, and one whom he did not cherish much; when however in sore trouble, he is scorned or merely pitied by the first two, while the third cheerfully saves him, whereupon the moral, that wealth and friends avail one not, but only virtues and good works. This essentially different parable is found in the *Libro de Exemplos*, No. 16, as edited by Morel Fatio.<sup>52</sup>

5. Love for Woman.

As mentioned above, I may add:

1. Villegas, *Fructus Sanctorum*, fo. 335, v<sup>o</sup>.

2. Another version, l. c., fo. 335, v<sup>o</sup>.

3. Feliciano de Silva, *Segunda Comedia de Celestina*, cena 31.<sup>52</sup>

4. Ribadeneyra, *Flos S.*, 1616, vol. ii, 485.<sup>54</sup>

48 Riv. li, p. 557.

49 Liebrecht, p. 95-97.

50 As also the one published for the first time in *Romania*, p. 493. The *Disc. Cler.*, in Migne, *Patrol. S. Lat.* vol. 157, p. 673-4, contains the same story and the one following in *Romania* as if they belonged together, though we find them headed *Fabula Prima* and *Fabula ii*, for which latter see also Cifar, p. 25-31.

51 Sometimes only half of one, *Rom.* vii, p. 493; *Castigos & Docum.* p. 157, both after *Disc. Cler.*; or one and a half, as in *Lucanor*, 48.

52 *Rom.* vii, p. 491-92.

53 *Col. de Libr. Raros & Cur.*, vol. ix, p. 373.

54 In the play by Villanueva Nufiez, Josafat declares that what has most impressed him is the human face, by its endless variety. The same trait is found, for example, in the beginning of *Lucanor* (Patronio, Riv. li, p. 368); *Libro d. l. Enx.* 332 (p. 527); *La lozana Andaluza* (*Col. de Libros Esp. Raros & Curiosos*, vol. i) p. 312; Antonio Sanchez Tortoles, *El Entretenido*, vol. i, 1729, p. 227; all after Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, Lib. xii, cap. i.

Kuhn has (p. 82) an "Anhang ii. B. and J. als Heilige der-Christlichen Kirche."

Of the special breviaries of Spanish churches, I have inspected the following, all in the Bibl. Nacional, none of which contains the slightest mention of our Saints:

1. Breviarium Gothicum, ed. Lorenzana, Madrid, 1775.<sup>55</sup>

2. Missale Muzarabicum, MS. D. D. 65.<sup>56</sup>

3. Acta et Passiones Martyrum, MS. D. D. 34, 35, 36.<sup>57</sup>

4. Breviarium Burgense, s. a. MS.

5. Brev. Caesaraugustanum. 1497.

6. Brev. Zamoran. s. a.

7. Brev. Segobiense. s. a.

8. Brev. Oscense et Iacense, Zarag., 1505.

9. Brev. Maioric. Venet., 1506.

10. Brev. bracharense. Salam., 1512.

11. Brev. Ces'august. 1527.

12. Brev. Gienense. Hispal., 1528.

13. Brev. Salmantic., s. l. 1541.

14. Brev. Dertus. 1547.

15. Brev. Ebor. Olysipp., 1548.

16. Brev. Pompelon. (*sic*) 1551.

17. Brev. Placent. Venet., 1553.

18. Brev. Conchens. Cuenca, 1558.

19. Brev. Segunt. Seguntiae, 1561.

20. Brev. Ilerdens. Lerida, 1571.

The writer would be thankful for any data that might lead to further additions to this paper.

F. DE HAAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

## GERMAN GRAMMAR.

*Deutsche Grammatik.* Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- und Neuhochdeutsch, von W. WILMANN'S. Erste Abteilung: Lautlehre. Strassburg: 1893. 8vo, pp. xix, 332.

THE book was noted under "Brief Mention" in Vol. viii, No. 6 of the NOTES. As the first part is now complete and the rest does not give signs of forthcoming, the time has perhaps come for a fuller review.

The title obviously suggests a comparison with Kauffmann's little book, *Deutsche Grammatik, Kurzgefasste Laut- und Formenlehre*

55 Sanchez Moguel, l. c. p. 55, note 42.

56 Sanch. Mog. note 43.

57 *Ibid.* p. 57, note 47.

des Gotischen, Alt-, Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutschen, itself a revision of Vilmar's *Grammar*. There is little or no similarity between the two books, however. Kauffmann treats in outline merely, is schematic, emphasizes the older periods; Wilmanns, on the contrary, treats, not without some diffuseness, in detail, and gives most prominence to New High German. Hence a certain lack of proportion is observable in the book; the historic foundation has been slighted, important matters entirely omitted. Aside from the "Übersicht der Laute" there are no introductory statements of any kind. This is the more to be regretted since from its very plan, as indicated by the title, the book is rather heterogeneous in character, though one may fully agree with the author when he says ("Vorrede," p. vi), "Dass ich das Gotische zum Ausgangspunkt nahm, obwohl es nicht die Muttersprache des Deutschen ist, erschien mir durchaus unbedenklich und wird niemanden irren."

His aim and method the author outlines as follows ("Vorrede," pp. vi-vii):

Mein Ziel war, ein Lehrbuch der historischen Grammatik für die zu schreiben, die sich für das höhere Lehrfach vorbereiten. Daher habe ich mich beschränkt auf die Sprachen, deren Kenntnis von ihnen vorausgesetzt wird, auf das Gotische, Althochdeutsche, Mittelhochdeutsche und Neuhochdeutsche. . . . Von fremden Sprachen habe ich . . . fast nur das Griechische und Lateinische herangezogen und bloss construierte Sprachformen, so viel es anging, gemieden.

This last feature will, however, be regarded as an element of weakness, rather than of strength, by the large class of teachers and students who have, for a long time past, felt the need of a compendium of Comparative Grammar from the German side, a compendium that should be scientific in its matter, and still perspicuous and easily intelligible in its manner of presentation, a book such as we have for the Classical Languages in the grammars of Brugmann and Stolz. The articles in Paul's *Grundriss* do not meet the latter of these requirements, and Wilmanns' book also, from the very limitations indicated above, falls short of them. For text-books ostensibly on a comparative basis, this fearfulness of citing forms not perfectly familiar, of drawing illustrations from

languages other than classical, this inclination towards leaving half the story untold, under-rating the serious purpose of the reader and shunning difficulties and problems in favor of carefully culled examples to illustrate theoretically general rules, have played an altogether too prominent part in the text-books of the past. It should at once be added, however, that aside from his treatment of the "Vorgeschichte" Wilmanns does not err in the last of these particulars. On the contrary, his statements of problems, of possible solutions, are, to my mind, the most valuable part of his work, from a scientific as well as from a pedagogical point of view. The author is decidedly at his best here: his command of the material is admirable, his analysis searching, his statement lucid. The advantage to the student of the perspective thus gained is not easily overestimated. It serves to bring him in touch with the work of his time, and by telling him what is known, gives him a basis from which to work, and at the same time indicates the direction that future investigations must or may follow.

To enter upon details of treatment, there is under the heading of "Übersicht der Laute" a survey of phonetic facts. This outline is very unsatisfactory, so much so, that the disclaimer entered by the author: "Die folgenden Bemerkungen sollen nicht in die Phonetik einführen," will scarcely serve as an excuse. The table of consonants (§ 8) is altogether inadequate. It seems to have been constructed solely for New High German, but even then there is no way provided for distinguishing, for example, between front and back *ch*. The great variety of terms employed to designate one and the same class of sounds are also confusing. For stops we have "Explosivae," "Verschluss- oder Schlaglaute;" for spirants, "Spirantes," "Reibelaute," "Fricativae." Such a sentence as: "Um die . . . Reibelaute zu bezeichnen, nimmt man früher gebräuchliche Zeichen zu Hülfe: für die stimmhaften Spiranten *b, d, g*, für den stimmlosen dentalen Reibelaut *p*" (p. 5) cannot but lead a beginner astray. That these shortcomings are not due to excessive condensation may be seen by comparing Wilmanns' "Übersicht" with the introductory statements concerning Phonetics



in Brugmann's *Grundriss*, which, while less detailed, are far more satisfactory. This deficiency is the more to be regretted since the author has, in various places, paid so much attention to phonetic problems. In itself this is a refreshing sign. The principles of phonetics have been altogether too little applied to the phenomena of Germanic Grammar. We have had little more than the statement and grouping of established facts, without attempt to arrive at a *rationale* of sound change; phonetic analysis and generalisation have been extremely rare. The truism that there can be no real science until the causal relations among facts are investigated, seems to have been almost ignored. Wilmanns' attitude in this particular is very original and deserves to be followed, even though one may not agree with his conclusions in every particular. For attempts to explain sound-change according to phonetic principles, cf. pp. 94, 98, 161, 167, 172.

A curious tendency to personify language, to regard it as having a conscious purpose, shows itself here and there, involuntarily recalling the warning sounded against this in the Introduction to the *Morphologische Untersuchungen* of Osthoff and Brugmann. Though an unscientific conception of language at best, it may perhaps be merely regarded as an element of style where it concerns such metaphorical expressions as "Die nhd. Schriftsprache verhält sich ablehnend" (p. 228), or "... während *h* den Platz behauptete, der ihm ursprünglich zukam, und seine spätere Eroberung allmählich an *ch* aufgeben musste, behauptete sich *f* umgekehrt auf dem jünger erworbenen Platz und verlor die alte Besetzung mehr und mehr an das neu aufgenommene *v*" (p. 79). Here and there, however, this conception seems to have influenced the author's judgment. So on p. 197 where, after discussing the character of the new diphthongization as distinguished from the old, he concludes:

"Der Grund dass die Sprache schliesslich die umgekehrte Bahn verfolgte, kann darin liegen, dass sie die Diphthonge *ie*, *uo*, *üe* bereits besass."

Again, on pp. 202-3:

"Die Lücke, welche sich durch die Beseitigung der langen *i*, *a*, *u* im Vocalsystem ergeben

hatte, wurde bald dadurch wieder ausgefüllt, dass die Diphthonge *ie*, *uo*, *üe* zu *i*, *u*, *ü* zusammengezogen wurden. Die beiden Vorgänge fügen sich so gut zu einander, dass man ursächlichen Zusammenhang vermuten möchte, doch hat ein solcher nicht stattgefunden."

So p. 217 *à propos* of the change in quantity and accent in New High German as compared with Middle High German:

"Natürlich könnte auch in einem Teil der Fälle die Änderung des Accenten, in einem anderen die Änderung in der Quantität das nächste Ziel der Sprache gewesen sein."

For other instances, cf. pp. 26, 27, 82.

An error of judgment was also made, it seems to me, in adhering in this larger work to the division of strong verbs adopted in the author's *Deutsche Schulgrammatik*. Classes iii, iv and v (according to Braune's grouping) are there united under the head of Class I, without further subdivision. In the present work the author has subdivided these as I<sup>a</sup> (=V), I<sup>b</sup> (=IV) and I<sup>c</sup> (=III) not, however, without now and then lapsing into error through still using his old terminology, saying I where he means I<sup>a</sup> and I<sup>b</sup>, etc. (cf. pp. 151, 158). This nomenclature, in origin the Müllenhoff classification, is naturally enough not explained anywhere in the *present* volume, and will prove very perplexing to one acquainted only with Sievers' *Ablaut*-rows. The author's choice may have been determined by his aim to write a grammar for those "die sich für das höhere Lehrfach vorbereiten," but it seems a pity that the uniformity in nomenclature which gives fair promise of becoming established, should be retarded by such variations from the usage of standard grammars.

In his spelling of Gothic words the author has followed Braune. Many forms with *v* instead of *w* have crept in, however. So *vigan* p. 9, *svaihra*, *svaihrô* p. 13, *vulfs* p. 14, *vaurhta*, *vaurkjan* p. 23, *vaist* p. 24, *valvisôn*, *hlaivasna*, *vileis*, *vileizu*, *tuzvêrjan* p. 86, *vai* p. 106, and numerous other instances. Inconsistent also is the writing of *mims* on p. 94 with *s*, as compared with *aiz* on p. 86 with *z*.

A few other criticisms as to details.—P. 13. *gewesen* is not a very happily chosen example of preservation of *s* as compared with *waren*. —P. 16. The statement in §27 would seem to

be refuted by the identification made on p. 14 of German *ge-* and Latin *co-*.—P. 99. Sievers does not attempt to explain the Gothic forms *lasius* and *usskawjan*. The former he does not even mention; concerning the latter he merely remarks, "Aus unbekanntem Grunde ist die alte Silbentrennung in *usskawjan* geblieben."—P. 144. "vocallose  $\eta$ ,  $\gamma$ " seems a rather unfortunate expression.—P. 205. The statement that Veldeke never rimes *ie* with *i* is incorrect. Cf. p. 204.

The book is printed with a fair degree of correctness. Of misprints perhaps the following need correction: p. 28. Read "*z* und *k*" instead of "*z* und *h*."—P. 47. Read "In- und Anlaut" instead of "In- und Auslaut."—P. 151. Read  $\gamma\acute{o}v\upsilon$  instead of  $\gamma\omicron v\acute{u}$ .—P. 159. Read *Segimirus*.—P. 164. Read "*e*<idg. *e*" instead of "*e*>idg. *e*." On p. 171 this same sign is used in a rather questionable manner in "Idg.  $\tilde{z}$ , g.  $\tilde{z}$ >hd.  $\tilde{a}$ ."—P. 176. Read "Vor *w*" instead of "Vor *a*."—P. 206. Read "in den md. Hss." instead of "in den nd. Hss."—P. 229. Read "*a* und *e*" instead of "*o* und *e*."—P. 234. Read "die unbetonten Vor- und Endsilben" instead of "die betonten Vor- und Endsilben."

It will be seen that the exceptions taken to the work refer to a large extent either to sins of omission or to matters of detail. As to the first, much that seemed needed in Part I has, no doubt, been purposely reserved for the hypothetical fifth volume. On the other hand Streitberg's *Deutsche Grammatik* as announced by Messrs. Breitkopf and Härtel (cf. *Indog. Forsch.*, iii. Bd. Anz. No. 3, p. 188) will probably supply the historical foundation that seems to be somewhat lacking in Wilmanns. As to criticism of details, I am conscious that a review written from an American point of view cannot but do some injustice to a book that was written for a German public and that a particular kind of German public. Withal it remains a serviceable class-book and suggestive book of reference.

B. J. Vos.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### FRENCH READINGS.

*A Scientific French Reader*, by ALEXANDER W. HERDLER, Instructor in Modern Lang-

uages, Princeton University. 8vo, pp. 186. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1894.

*An Introduction to French Authors*, being a Reader for Beginners, by ALPHONSE N. VAN DAELE, Professor in the Mass. Institute of Technology. 8vo, pp. 251. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1894.

SOME familiarity with the more common scientific terms is now-a-days a necessity for every reader of modern literature. A *Scientific French Reader* is, therefore, to be considered not merely as an introduction for the scientific student into the literature of his special science; its plan and contents should be such as to familiarize the ordinary student of French with the language and terminology of French works on science. Mr. Herdler's little volume seems to meet these two requirements. A part of the second year in French, say from eight to ten weeks, could hardly be spent more profitably than in the study of these one hundred and forty pages, not counting the space of about seventeen pages filled with illustrations. The forty-eight selections contained in the book treat of the most interesting applications of physics, chemistry, mechanics, and electricity, and include essays on the modern methods of locomotion, on recent architecture and technological processes. It would be difficult to suggest a more attractive method of teaching the student so much of scientific French as every reader of the language ought to know, than this *Reader* provides. The notes (10 pp.) and especially the vocabulary (20 pp.), which are both indispensable, have evidently been prepared with the greatest care and will be found quite sufficient.

The first part (113 pp.) of Professor Van Daell's *Reader for Beginners* leaves nothing to be desired; the selections are sufficiently easy, well adapted for young pupils, short and yet complete in themselves, and, with only one or two exceptions, all from writers of the nineteenth century. Poetry is but sparingly represented, about one-third of the whole number of selections, occupying hardly more than one-tenth of the space, being in verse. Foot-notes judiciously used in Part I, and a vocabulary (for the whole book) make this part convenient and attractive for beginners.



As to the utility of Part II, the opinions of teachers will be divided. Ten pages of descriptive geography and forty pages devoted to a "Résumé d'histoire de France" will by some be found handy for reference, and as a source of useful information not so easily attainable in any other way. But would not a map of France, such as Delagrave & Co. and other houses publish and sell for a few cents, placed in the hands of every pupil, accomplish better the end which the author seeks to attain by his chapter on geography (the maps in the book are decidedly too small and indistinct)? And would not the author's purpose "to awaken their [the pupils'] dormant curiosity for history, for all the higher forms of French literature" have been better served by the introduction of a few more chapters from the most brilliant French historians, similar to that from Michelet, the only one in the book, than by means of hundreds of brief statements of historical facts in chronological order? It is true, if the teacher use this part of the *Reader* in accordance with the author's suggestions, and if he be a good teacher of history as well as of languages, and skillful in combining the two, the results will be satisfactory enough. At all events, the author is right in his demand for a better knowledge of, and greater interest in, French history on the part of students of French, and it is much to be hoped that his book will further their attainment. Some notes on the authors represented in the *Reader*, not so much biographical as introductory to their works, aiding the interested student in choosing some of the best volumes for private reading, might not have been out of place in an *Introduction to French Authors*.

A. LODEMAN.

*Ypsilanti, Mich.*

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Le Monde où l'on s'ennuie*, Comédie en trois actes par ÉDOUARD PAILLERON, with introduction and English notes by A. C. PENDLETON, M. A., Professor of modern languages, Bethany College, W. Va. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston: 134 pp., 1894.

THE editor of this edition has done her work in a manner worthy of the highest praise. She

has brought to the attention of students of French the most charming of recent French comedies, and has shown delicate feeling in rendering into English those parts of the text in which a student might be expected to find difficulties.

Thirteen years after its first appearance, this comedy still continues to delight and amuse the patrons of the Comédie Française. Few French plays produced since 1850 have enjoyed such a success.

Whether it was the intention of M. Pailleron to satirize Caro, or some one else, matters little. The essential fact is that the *précieux* are still with us, and that the author aimed another blow at their affectation. Till a comparatively recent time, it has been claimed by literary historians that Molière gave them their death-blow. This was by no means the case. Amid wars and revolutions and the brute force of Paris mobs, their voices have been hushed, but they have lived on, and now invade the halls of the Sorbonne and the Collège de France itself. It was against them that Boileau directed his *Satires*, and Roederer<sup>1</sup> has shown that they still rose bolder and more brilliant than before. Quinault was their darling. In 1677 they caballed against *Phèdre* in favor of Pradon. Voltaire attacked the traces of affectation which he discovered in the comedies of Marivaux, in the sermons of Massillon and even in Montesquieu. Was there not something of it also in the young men who gathered around Victor Hugo in 1830? And are not the symbolists the heirs of a long lineage? The lecture room of Caro was the modern Hôtel de Rambouillet, and the aim of Pailleron was similar to the aim of Molière.

THOMAS LOGIE

*Rutgers College.*

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Cinq-Mars ou une conjuration sous Louis XIII* par le C<sup>te</sup> ALFRED DE VIGNY de l'Académie française, abridged and edited, with introduction and notes, by CHARLES SANKEY, M. A., Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893. xxvii+265 pp., 80.

<sup>1</sup> "Mémoire pour servir à l'histoire de la Société polie en France." Paris, 1835.

THE story of the times of Richelieu is exciting enough when told by some dry historian, but there are no limits to its interest when molded by the art of such a novelist as de Vigny. The historical novel is as fascinating reading as exists, and mainly because its characters did really live and move in this world, and though the historical events may not have occurred exactly as told by the novelist, yet, through the latter's skill, they become more vivid and appeal with greater power to our memory, as well as to our imagination. The mistakes, or changes, may be corrected by consulting some accurate history and thus, by means of these two influences—the novelist's and the historian's—we become thoroughly acquainted with some particular period of the world's history. This is what de Vigny did for all French readers when he wrote *Cinq-Mars*, and, in a relative way, this is what has been done for students by Mr. Sankey in his edition of this well-known work. The interest of the reader is sustained from the opening page to the very end, there is hardly a single uninteresting line, and at the close we only wish the novel were continued, and continued indefinitely, so as to include all historical happenings. It is true that de Vigny is sometimes painfully inaccurate, but his blunders, for the most part probably intentional, are so prominent, that they can be distinctly remembered and corrected later by reading the historical introduction of Mr. Sankey, for the editor has taken pains to correct all historical inaccuracies and to impress them as errors on the mind of the student.

The notes are as full and as conscientiously prepared as notes well could be; every personage is discussed, every allusion, every interesting point is explained, and the whole is positively an intellectual treat to the reader. The editor is careful not to run into extremes, not to be too partial nor yet too condemning, and it is a real pleasure to read what he has to say. If the character of a lexicographer can be inferred from his definitions of words, so may the character of an editor be understood from his notes, and here is one of Mr. Sankey's (the italics being mine): commenting on the word *parvenu*, as applied by de Vigny to

Richelieu, he says "this epithet, true enough of Mazarin and others, is unjust when used of Richelieu; *not that it is ever a reproach in the eyes of a sensible man.*" If we may infer from this note anything concerning the character and conscientiousness of the editor, we are not surprised at the pleasure afforded by the perusal of this text.

This is great praise, and it is exactly here that the danger lies; it might be said, and with almost too great an approach to the truth, that this text is suited for teachers especially, and not even for all teachers, but only for the more ambitious. I should be afraid lest students, even at the end of their second year, would not profit, as I might wish, by the excellent editing of this story, even though by rapid reading, they find the narrative, in itself, most absorbing. This is however a "danger," not a fault, and it simply behooves the teacher himself to be careful not to use this text too early in the course.

EDWIN S. LEWIS

Princeton University.

#### FRENCH LANGUAGE.

1. *Minimum French Grammar and Reader* with Exercises and Graded Selections for Reading and Dictation, and Review Exercises for Translation into French. By EDWARD S. JOYNES. 8vo, viii, 269 pp. New York: Henry Holt and Co.; F. W. Christern. Boston: Carl Schoenhof. 1893. Price, 80 cents.
2. *Livre de lecture et de conversation.* Par C. FONTAINE. 8vo, vi, 249 pp. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1893. Price, 95 cents.
3. *An Introduction to the French Language.* Being a Practical Grammar with Exercises. By ALPHONSE N. VAN DAELL. 8vo, xvii, 229 pp. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893. Price, \$1.
4. *The Living Method for Learning how to Think in French.* By CHARLES F. KROEH. 140, vii pp. London and Hoboken, N. J. Published by the Author. Price, \$1.
5. a. *Enseignement par les yeux* (Leçons de choses) basé sur les cartes murales d'ÉDOUARD HOELZEL. Par A. BECHTEL.



Édition destinée à l'enseignement primaire supérieur. 8vo, x, 147 pp. Vienne: Édouard Hoelzel, 1893.

b. Handausgabe von HÖLZEL'S *Wandbildern* als Beigabe zu BECHTEL'S *Enseignement par les yeux* (Leçons de choses) und zu WINTER'S "*Hölzel's Wandbilder in ihrer praktischen Verwendung beim deutschen Sprachunterrichte*." Acht Bilder in Farbendruck, Bildgrösse 19/29 Cm. Wien: Ed. Hölzel. Price, Fl. 0.80 (35 cts).

6. a. *A Short French Grammar*. By C. H. GRANDGENT. 8vo, x, 150 pp. Price, 60 cents.

b. *French Lessons and Exercises* to be used with Grandgent's Short French Grammar. 1. *First Year's Course for Schools*. Number 1. 12mo, 1, 34 pp. 2. *First Year's Course for Colleges*. Number 1. 12mo, 1, 42 pp. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1894.

PROFESSOR JOYNES' endeavor (No. 1) to shorten the grammatical material and gain, in this way, more time and space for reading in the elementary instruction of French, is a highly praiseworthy one. The arrangement of his book does not differ much (excepting in details and, perhaps, in the graded selections for reading) from the traditional method which still seems to be the favorite mode of teaching in the United States: Some remarks upon orthography (Chapter i) and pronunciation (Chapters ii-iv); then small portions of grammar, a few forms, rules or explanations (Chapter v: a. The Articles, b. Present Tenses of *avoir* and *être*; Chapter vi: a. Nouns, b. Present and Imperative of regular verbs, etc.), followed by lists of words, a considerable number of disconnected French sentences and a French story or anecdote, entire or fragmentary; and, finally, several pages (pp. 204-229) containing review exercises, that is, disconnected English sentences and English phrases of the above mentioned French stories and anecdotes for translating into French.

The first chapter, which treats of orthography, includes remarks upon pronunciation, especially upon stress and quantity. Some of these are very curious. "Pronunciation," says the author (p. 5), "must be learned from the teacher" (very good). Cf. also Preface, p. v.

"The Pronunciation is placed, where it belongs, at the beginning, but with due help may be better studied along with the earliest grammar lessons than in a body beforehand. The directions given are intended to be simply helpful and approximate: only voice can teach voice (*very well said!*). No attempt, however, is made at phonetic transliteration, because none is believed to be helpful (?) in elementary work."

The writer himself apparently does not think much of his "indications" concerning pronunciation (Chapters i-iv). I believe they are mostly quite useless and frequently not "helpful," but hurtful for teachers and pupils. The author might have shortened and, certainly, also improved his book a great deal by leaving out these "indications" altogether. I may be allowed to quote a few passages chosen at random:

"Circumflex vowels are long." (p. 2). "A consonant between two vowels is joined with the latter; as *pro-ba-bi-li-té*. . . . It will be observed that this gives to the vowels a more open and distinct sound than in English." (P. 2). "The terms long and short are, however, frequently used to mark the quality of the vowel, rather than quantity proper. In general the value of any syllable in French depends rather on the tonic accent than on quantity—as also in English." (P. 3). "In poetry this *e* (*e muet*) is usually sounded. . . . A silent final consonant leaves the syllable open, as though the word ended with the preceding vowel; as, *cas*, pronounced *ca*. In such case the vowel is usually long." (P. 4). "The usual pronunciation of the simple vowels is as follows: *a* long, like *a* in *father*; *car*, *cas*, *mât*, *pâte*. *a* short, like *a* in *alas*; *ma*, *mal*, *malade*, *patte*. *e* closed, like *e* in *met*; *avec*, *tel*, *telle*, *blesse*. *e* open, like *e* in *over*; *le*, *me*, *ne*, *leva*, *releva*. . . ." (P. 5).

It cannot be expected that a phonetist should comment upon or seriously criticise statements that contain so strange and peculiar opinions.

Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are exceedingly clever books. The most radical and at the same time most consistent of the three authors is Mr. Kroeh. If judged by a cool and critical observer, he would appear too zealous and demonstrative in praising the excellence of his own work or works. But I like his enthusiasm, and I should be glad to know that he has won a great many friends and followers

who teach modern languages in the class-room according to his, or similar views, with the same enthusiasm and success. I also hope his efforts and example will help destroy the routine of "recitation lessons" (alas! still prevalent in modern-language instruction throughout the majority of American schools), the dreary imitation of Latin and Greek lessons, and make the formula, "to hear the lesson," a British archaism in this country, at least for the department of modern languages. Mr. Kroeh considers his system as an outgrowth of the Natural Method, "invented" in 1865 by Prof. Gottlieb Heness and widely diffused since by the zeal of Dr. L. Sauveur and others (cf. p. 141). The exercises contained in his *Living Method for Learning how to think in French* have been designed by the author for self-instruction and as a supplement to instruction received in the class-room, no matter what method is employed by the professor (cf. p. 141).

The confident "inventor" of the *Living Method* seems to think pronunciation a comparatively easy and secondary matter which may be learned by self-instruction. He says (p. 3):

"If(!) you need any assistance as regards the pronunciation, send for a copy of Kroeh's Pronunciation of French, published by the author, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J. Price, 35 c. In this little book all the difficulties of pronunciation are carefully explained and illustrated in progressive exercises."

The author is evidently a good business-man, but I do not understand how all the different classes of students using his work on the *Living Method*, either with or without explanations concerning pronunciation, either without any teacher or with a teacher, either with a teacher following the same method or with a teacher employing another method, can succeed in thinking in French, speaking French continually, and "keeping out the English" in their instruction. I fancy most of them, and certainly such as study the *Living Method* without a teacher, will acquire, in this way, "some sort of language" which, so far as it is meant to be a spoken language, will necessarily bear but a very faint resemblance to real French. However, it seems to me

likely that they will soon give up their original design, return to their old linguistic habits in spite of the author's good advice and precepts, and do as they did before, that is, think in English and speak English. I could not, and would not, blame them for their turning from the new study, for I do not see any use in learning "some sort of language" instead of French.

Do not promise too much, and do not try to satisfy everybody—this is an excellent business principle for writers of school-books and inventors of methods.

Mr. Fontaine, being a native of France, probably thinks that pronunciation is a matter of secondary importance and can be easily acquired by students, because he himself has never felt any difficulty in pronouncing French correctly and fluently. There are, accordingly, no indications whatever concerning French sounds in his whole book (No. 2), and I really believe, to say nothing at all about so difficult a subject is better than to give directions and explanations of doubtful value and of a kind similar to those given in some of the works noted here. The author only remarks in his preface:

"Si . . l'étude d'une langue a pour but de donner aux élèves une connaissance pratique de cette langue, il faut que, dès les premières leçons, l'élève commence à se familiariser avec ses sons: voilà pourquoi on a écrit ce livre entièrement en français."

The writer evidently means that the pupil has to learn a correct pronunciation by practice from a teacher who pronounces well himself, and he does not seem to doubt the truth of Professor Joynes' observation that pronunciation must be learned from the teacher, and that only voice can teach voice (see above). The book is written entirely in French, and combines skilfully the conversational and object-lesson method with grammatical exercises, treated more or less from a French point of view. I am sure it will prove very useful, especially in the elementary instruction of conscientious teachers of French nationality, and in every school where French is taught as a living language, and not, like Latin and Greek, only for the sake of a reading-knowledge and some grammatical notions.



I do not like the exercises in which Mr. Fontaine, following the example of French grammars published for the use of schools in France, has purposely made grammatical mistakes which the pupils are supposed to correct. Such exercises seem to me rather useless and really dangerous for foreign students.—A few misprints have crept into the work; as, for instance, *il vainct (vainc—p. 238).*

Dr. van Daell's *Introduction to the French Language* (No. 3) is the work of an able, intelligent and progressive teacher who knows his subject well, and likes to increase his knowledge and improve his methods. It is apparently the result of many years' experience and long, careful preparation. It has many features, many good features, in common with Fontaine's *Livre de lecture et de conversation*, and also combines the conversational and object-lesson method with grammatical exercises. But these have been arranged by the author in a greater measure from the stand-point of English speakers, and exhibit the influence of the traditional translation-method (*thèmes and versions*), probably in order to suit the taste of the great mass of instructors. The book is provided with a French-English and an English-French vocabulary, and most of the explanations are given in English. I presume French teachers of American or English nationality will accept it, for these reasons, with more readiness than the work of Mr. Fontaine.

I am glad that Mr. van Daell has given up his antipathy for phonetics, and that he is beginning to appreciate its usefulness in teaching modern languages. Some of his "Practical Remarks on French Pronunciation" (pp. xv-xxvii) show clearly that he has studied with much profit a few works upon phonetics; he is, as I like to repeat, a progressive teacher, open to conviction and accessible to new ideas. Cf. Preface, p. iv:

"I have not attempted the impossible task of rendering French pronunciation by English equivalents."

I think the author has acted very wisely in not attempting this impossible and entirely useless task.

... "If one will make a study of the science of Phonetics, he can arrive at excellent results (!) and understand an accurate representation of sounds: it would be an absurdity (! ?) to attempt anything of the kind in a book destined for the mass of pupils. But I hope that the time is not far distant when most teachers of language will give this point the attention which it so fully deserves (!), and which has so generally been refused (!)."

Very well. Good and sensible teachers are more useful and necessary than the most excellent text-books!

Hölzel's *Wandbilder* (Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter, Farm, Mountains, Forest, and City), the large-sized pictures as well as the copies on a reduced scale, indicated above (No. 5, b), are to serve the aims and needs of the object-lesson method. They are favorably known in Austria and Germany, and much used in the schools of these countries in the elementary instruction of German, English, and French.

Mr. Bechtel's *Enseignement par les yeux* (No. 5, a), a long commentary upon the pictures just noted, composed of numberless questions and answers, is rather dry and monotonous reading, and can be made interesting only by a frequent and casual improvisation in the class-room and the enlivening voice of the teacher. It may be of some use, I think, for those who have not yet had much experience in teaching, and wish to get acquainted with the ways and means of the *Anschaunungsunterricht* applied to a foreign language. But a teacher who does not speak French quite fluently, and is obliged to rely entirely upon such a commentary, ought not to venture upon the object-lesson method: his attempt would undoubtedly be a tremendous failure.

Mr. Grandgent's new book (No. 6, a) is a concise, clear, accurate and systematic exposition of everything that is essential and absolutely necessary for a foreigner in the abstract study of French grammar. It is, moreover, a somewhat modest, but very intelligent endeavor to base French grammar on phonetics; and as it is the first attempt of the kind in this country, I esteem it a work of the highest importance. I hope it will be introduced into

many schools and thus prepare the minds of teachers and students for further and greater reforms. It fully deserves the praise that has been so liberally bestowed upon it and so heartily expressed in a great number of recommendations printed in the publishers' catalogue.\*

I shall not undertake, here, to criticise certain details of Grandgent's *Short French Grammar*; I think it unnecessary since I have already informed the author himself of what I consider as objectionable or insufficient in it, and capable of improvement for later editions. Besides, the book is being practically tested this year in a beginners' class at the Johns Hopkins University.

The exercises relating to the different parts of Grandgent's grammar, and destined for different courses of schools and colleges, have been and will be published separately (No. 6, b).

A. RAMBEAU.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### NODIER AND PETER IBBETSON

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In recent numbers of the *Critic* (Nov. 17, 24, Dec. 1) interest in Du Maurier's story *Trilby* expressed itself in an inquiry concerning Nodier's charming *conte* of the same name. The fact was brought out that Musset makes use of this name in his *Réponse à M. Charles Nodier* and that Balzac employs it as the name of a type in the "Histoire des Treize" (*Scènes de la Vie Parisienne*, 1843, vol. 1, p. 48). The scene of Nodier's story is laid in Scotland, his *Trilby* is a sort of household fairy or familiar, and is moreover apparently of the masculine gender. Unless we may suppose the origin of the *Trilby* family to be like that of the Tweedys, we may conclude that only in name and nationality is it possible that he was our *Trilby's* ancestor.

This evidence, however, of Du Maurier's knowledge of Nodier encourages one to consider the question whether the seed-thought of Du Maurier's earlier work, *Peter Ibbetson*,

\*Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, pp. 436-67.

may not have been found in Nodier's pages, albeit in a work of very different character from the *contes*. In the *Mélanges tirés d'une Petite Bibliothèque*, Paris. 1829, pp. 209-212, Nodier speaks of a little volume ("à la vérité fort rare") *L'Art de se rendre Heureux par les Songes*, c'est-à-dire en se procurant telle espèce de songe que l'on puisse désirer conformément à ses inclinations. Francfort et Leipsic, 1746, in-8; v. fauve.

Nodier does not understand why this work has been attributed to Franklin. Furthermore, he says:

"On n'oseroit prononcer non plus bien positivement sur la question de savoir s'il faut le regarder comme une spéculation adroite sur la crédulité des malheureux qui éprouvent le besoin, si commun sur la terre, d'embellir leur sommeil par des illusions que la vie refuse, ou comme un simple jeu d'imagination."

He goes on in his gravely humorous way to say that the directions given are like those of the alchemist or magician—e. g., to find the plant before which chains drop and bolts fly, one must first find "un nid de pie noire" and "malheureusement il n'y a point de pie noire." But he would not, he says, pretend to deny the possibility of such a science as that which the book teaches or to affirm its inaccessibility to man's investigating spirit. No one, he thinks, can have failed to note the fact that particular sorts of dreams recur consequent upon particular hygienic conditions—he has been assured, he tells us, by persons of sober and serious character that their choice of food exerts a marked influence upon the nature of their dreams, in such a way as to render them more or less agreeable. Then more seriously "les enfants croient que l'usage de la cannelle donne des songes heureux, et j'ai retrouvé dans les prisons cette espèce de superstition que j'avois laissée dans le collège." Nodier regrets that these matters have never been examined in a philosophic spirit:

"il est déplorable que de pareilles questions restent en proie aux folies des onéiromanciens et des charlatans. . . . Il seroit peut-être important d'examiner quel rôle ces illusions de la nuit ont joué dans nos croyances, dans nos erreurs, dans nos passions, dans nos crimes; et je suis persuadé qu'une bonne physiologie du sommeil auroit par exemple épargné de sanglantes méprises à la justice."



Certainly there seem to be here two or three unmistakable suggestions of Peter Ibbetson's curious faculty and experience. For another element, that of the continuity of his dream-experience, we may turn to Bulwer's *Pilgrims of the Rhine*, Chapter xxiii, entitled, "The Life of Dreams." There the "enthusiast" tells how he

"began to ponder whether it might not be possible to connect dreams together . . . to make one night continue the history of the other, so as to bring together the same shapes and the same scenes and thus lead a connected and harmonious life not only in the one half of existence, but in the other, the richer and more glorious half." "Oh [says one of Bulwer's characters, after hearing his story] could the German have bequeathed to us his secret, what a refuge should we possess from the ills of earth! The dungeon and disease, poverty, affliction, shame, would cease to be the tyrants of our lot, and to Sleep we should confine our history and transfer our emotions."<sup>1</sup>

Du Maurier's personal contribution and enrichment of the basic notion consists in his blending of the dream-lives and dream-loves of Peter and the glorious Duchess of Towers. One need not suppose any hint or suggestion for this, but it seems quite possible that Du Maurier may have been reading some of the cases of "coincident dreaming" reported in the current works<sup>2</sup> treating of those strange goings-on in that queer borderland of hypnotism, somnambulism, suggestion, telepathy, and what-not, in which we all are—or have been—so interested.

It is somewhat curious that no work on dreams, even James Sully's pleasant article "Dreams as related to Literature" (*Forum*, vii, 67) mentions Nodier's *trouvaille* or Bulwer's romance. Considering the important part dreams have always played in literature, it would seem as if this use of them in a new direction by Bulwer and Du Maurier should be recorded. Indubitably we have in Du Maurier's story the ultimate fine flower of dream-romances, and an admirable example of a *genre* rare in our literature—the fantasy.

And Nodier's little article was, no doubt,

<sup>1</sup> Did Bulwer owe this idea to his studies in occultism?

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Podmore, F. *Apparitions and Thought-Transference*, Chap. x.

the cup which held the acorn from which the oaktree grew.<sup>3</sup>

CLARENCE GRIFFIN CHILD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

### EXPLANATION WANTED.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I should be glad if any Keltic scholar would explain the Gaelic words in the following stanza from 'The Howlat':—

"Sa come the Ruke with a rerd and a rane roch,  
A bard ow't of Irland with Banachadee:  
Said, 'Gluntow guk dynyd dach hala mischy doch;  
Raikie hir a rug of the rost, or scho sall ryiue the  
Mich macmory ach mach mometir moch loch:  
Set hir doune, gif hir drink; quhat dele alis the?  
O Dereinyne, O Donnall, O Dòchardy droch'—  
(Thir ar his Irland Kingis of the Irishcherye—)  
'O Knewlyn, O Conochor, O Gregre Makgrane;  
The schenachy, the clarschach,  
The ben schene, the ballach,  
The crekery, the corach,  
Scho kennis thaim ilkane.'"

WM. HAND BROWNE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

### LUTHER OM MESSENS CANON.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In one of his annual reports,<sup>1</sup> Chr. Bruun gives an account of a rare book from the Danish reformation, a translation by an unknown hand, of Luther's "Vom dem Grewel der Sillmesse: so man den Canon nennet." The full Danish title is: "Om den grum=/me forferdelige Tiende Messe/ som Papisterne bruge i deris /latine Messe oc kallis/ Canon. /Morthen Luther/ I Magdeborg /MD xxv./ It is accurately described by Bruun as "in very small quarto, consisting of 16 sheets, unpaginated. . . signed Aij to D . . . 31 lines to the page. . . There are two copies in the Royal Library; the one complete belonged to Suhm, the other to Hieltstjerne. Resen had another copy." The missing portions in B. are the title page and in the preface, pp. 5 and 6.

<sup>3</sup> Since writing the above. Dr. W. Hand Browne has told me of a dream-romance, involving the notion of continuity of the dream-experience, which appeared in the *New York Times* about the year 1875.

<sup>1</sup> *Aarsberetninger fra det Støre Kongelige Bibliotek*, 1869-74.



Several years ago, while in the Royal Library, my attention was called to these two books and an examination of the first page of each showed a number of slight variations not noted by Bruun in his otherwise detailed account. This discovery led me to compare the two carefully, with the result that the variations were found to be confined to the preface, the body of the work being the same in both copies. While such differences in early books are familiar enough from our own literature, even as late as Shakspeare, and by no means presuppose different editions, this case seems to be of special interest from the fact that the divergences are confined to a portion of the work. The reason for this I am wholly unable to state or even roughly to surmise, nor am I aware of any other instance of the kind.

All the divergences clearly fall under the head of printer's changes, substitutions of letters and differences in spacing and punctuation. Giving the forms in A, the complete copy, first and then those in B, and supplying pagination and line, the variations may be stated as follows :

Page 1; oc- och<sup>3</sup>, och- oc<sup>5</sup>, ath- at<sup>5</sup>, line ends with ath- with hwn<sup>5</sup>, ath her- at her=<sup>8</sup> dem/dem<sup>11</sup>, fatti=<sup>16</sup> wchris<sup>te</sup>- wchris<sup>19</sup>, ordinantz- ordinandz<sup>21</sup>, Almuen- almwen<sup>23</sup>, skul, skulle<sup>24</sup>, skickel- skickelse<sup>25</sup>, . -space<sup>28</sup>, Oc- och<sup>30</sup>.

Page 2.—Christelige- christelig<sup>1</sup>, vile- ville<sup>12</sup>, Da- Daa<sup>14</sup>, och- ock<sup>16</sup>, Oc- och<sup>17</sup>, swar- suar<sup>18</sup>, bespottel- bespottelse<sup>18</sup>, oc- och<sup>19</sup>, varre- vaare<sup>24</sup>, bespottel- bespottelse<sup>24</sup>, ladet- lad et<sup>27</sup>.

Page 3.—oc- och<sup>2</sup>, lenger- lenge<sup>4</sup>, vanwittighed- vanuittighed<sup>5</sup>, wforstandi=<sup>5</sup> wforstandigheds, fingre- line ends with dem<sup>6</sup>, och- oc<sup>7</sup>, omgengel=<sup>10</sup> omgengelse<sup>14</sup>, det- line ends with dem<sup>16</sup>, till- til<sup>19</sup>, de- line ends with 11<sup>19</sup>, cap.- ca.<sup>20</sup>, døden- line ends with samtøcke<sup>20</sup>, ath ware- athware<sup>23</sup>, oc- och<sup>24</sup>, till-til<sup>26</sup>, till-til<sup>27</sup>, ath- at<sup>29</sup>.

Page 4.—huad- hwad<sup>1</sup>, oc- och<sup>6</sup>, pa- begins the following line<sup>7</sup>, lade- begins the following line<sup>7</sup>, och- oc<sup>17</sup>, til- till<sup>18</sup>, ehwor- ehuor<sup>20</sup>, de synis- desynis<sup>21</sup>, Och- Oc<sup>21</sup>, meddeler- medlere<sup>23</sup>, til- till<sup>25</sup>, doden- døden<sup>27</sup>, swmmen- sum-

men<sup>28</sup>, oc- och<sup>30</sup>, komme- komme<sup>30</sup>, oc- och<sup>31</sup>, skyld/-skyld<sup>31</sup>.

Page 7, the last of the preface, is the same in both copies.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

### THE OLD ENGLISH OPTATIVE OF UNEXPECTED WISHING.-

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—It is generally assumed that sentences of the form, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" (Gen. 17, 18), corresponding to Latin sentences beginning with *utinam*, do not exist in Old English, or at least that there is no clear evidence of their existence. Thus Mätzner says (*Eng. Gram.* 3, 430): "Der älteren Sprache sind Sätze dieser Art, worin *that* dem Lat. *utinam* entspricht und die einen Hauptsatz mit dem Begriffe des Wunsches voraussetzen, fremd." He cites only: "And *þæt nān man nenne man ne underfō ne lānge* [var. 1. *nā leng*] *þonne þrēo niht* (*Legg. Cnut.* I, B. 25)." Koch remarks (*Hist. Gram.* 2, 46): "Der Optativ oder Conjunctiv des Präteritums mag ursprünglich die Aussage als eine solche hinstellen, deren Verwirklichung der Sprechende wünscht, wahrscheinlich schon im Ags., etwa wie: 'Wālā, āhte ic mīnra handa gewēald (*ach, hätte ich doch meiner Hände Gewalt*). C. 23, 32.'" Köch's example is not very conclusive, for Mätzner cites it as an example of a conditional sentence (3, 485): "Ahte ic mīnra handa gewēald, and mōste āne tīd ūte weorðan, wesān āne winterstunde, þonne ic mid þīs werode—." Mätzner's example does not conform to the instances that are familiar in modern English, because we should not naturally class it as a *utinam*-sentence, but rather as an elliptical sentence of command.

I have, however, found an example to which I believe no exception can be taken. It occurs in the Hatton MS. of the *Cura Pastoralis*, p. 445 of Sweet's edition, and is a translation of Rev. 3, 15: "Eālā, wære hē āuðer, oððe hāt oððe ceald!" Perhaps further search would bring other instances to light.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

## FRENCH PRONUNCIATION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—One is inclined eagerly to examine a paper<sup>1</sup> having for its subject the interesting topic chosen by Prof. McKibben. More than a year ago Prof. Koschwitz had published his *Parlers Parisiens*,<sup>2</sup>—a book that will always be prized for its valuable introduction in which the author gives a condensed, but complete, history of French pronunciation. With the impressions gained from a perusal of the latter volume fresh in the mind, a reader is likely to be disappointed in Prof. McKibben's pamphlet since it contains nothing new; furthermore, difficulty is experienced in attempting to discover on what principle the old material is arranged.

The general idea of the first part (pp. 1-7) seems to be that Paris furnishes the model for French pronunciation; that the number of people whose speech is accepted as correct is increasing rapidly and is no longer confined to any especial class. The writer next considers "the fact that those who speak well employ several kinds of good usage;" he illustrates this by alluding to the divergencies which appear in transcriptions of similar texts by Koschwitz and by Passy. Then, after referring to the constant but gradual changes taking place in language, he concludes:

"With these thoughts in mind, we may and should look for new light upon French pronunciation. But the old standard or standards, though slowly changing, are still valid; to them must conform all words and the pronunciation of those who use them."

Doubt will probably arise in a reader's mind as to the meaning of the terms "new light" and "old standards;" I think there may be some confusion throughout the article in the employment of the words "standard" and "usage."

Leaving aside these little exceptions, the paper will doubtless prove of value to many

<sup>1</sup> *Standards of French Pronunciation*. By George F. McKibben, Professor of French and German, Denison University, Granville, O: Read before the Ohio Modern Language Association, Dec. 27, 1893. Published by the Association: Columbus: Spahr & Glenn, 10 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Reviewed by Professor A. Rambeau in MOD. LANG. NOTES, ix, 276-285.

who have not made a particular study of the subject or who have not at hand such a manual as that of Koschwitz.

L. EMIL MENDER.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## DR. HALL'S "REJOINDER."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Dr. Fitzedward Hall's "Rejoinder" (MOD. LANG. NOTES, Nov. 1894) to my "Not So Very American" requires on my part some comments.

In the *Academy* for March 25, 1893 there appeared a communication from Dr. Hall, under the heading of "The American Dialect," in which many quotations from an American school book were cited as illustrating some of the baser elements of that dialect,—“substitutes” for the words and phrases of genuine English “such as should be pronounced intolerable.” The book from which Dr. Hall cited his examples was Mr. Eggleston's *First Book in American History*.

In reading the quotations from Mr. Eggleston's book, it seemed to me that some of the locutions censured by Dr. Hall were not Americanisms. A glance into a few English books and a hasty search in memoranda prepared for other matters quickly supplied, from British writings, citations parallel to a dozen or more locutions quoted from Mr. Eggleston. In the circumstances, I thought it worth while to point out the parallelism, and I did so in a very temperate, unpretentious little paper having the title, "Not So Very American," printed in MOD. LANG. NOTES, December, 1893. It was not at all within the scope of my remarks (much expanded in apparent length by the quotations supporting them) to "animadvert" on the opinions that made the staple of Dr. Hall's letter to the *Academy*.

But Dr. Hall, explaining the meaning of his *Academy* letter in seven columns of "Rejoinder" to my parallel quotations, scouts the idea that the locutions capped were cited by him as Americanisms. His rejection of the thought is vehement:

"The aim of Mr. Williams is to lay at my door that for which, if he made good his contention, I should justly be an object of contemptuous derision."

So far, then, there is progress. The locutions capped by parallel British citations are not Americanisms, and were not regarded as such by Dr. Hall. There remains to be considered whether my attributing to Dr. Hall the opinion that they were Americanisms involved an unreasonable construction and interpretation of his *Academy* letter,—or, to put the query somewhat differently,—whether Dr. Hall's "Rejoinder" does not read into his *Academy* letter esoteric meanings and restrictions that are not discoverable in the unexpounded text.

Dr. Hall's "Rejoinder" says: "Early last year there appeared in the London *Academy*, some strictures by me, under the heading of 'The American Dialect.'" In no part of the "Rejoinder" is there an intimation that the heading, as printed, was imposed (as might have happened) on his communication by the editor of the *Academy*. The title of the letter, "The American Dialect," may fairly be regarded, then, as indicating Dr. Hall's view of its subject-matter. But his "Rejoinder," in MOD. LANG. NOTES, shows that while, under the heading of "The American Dialect," he was censuring "locutions which go far to realize finished debasement"—(an odd purpose of theirs, but no matter)—and was illustrating such locutions from an American book exclusively, he really had in mind, not a dialect peculiarly American, but an international dialect—a dialect common to America and England. This concealed meaning of the *Academy* letter could not have been reached by an uninitiated student of it, and naturally, therefore, I supposed that *Americanisms* were referred to by "substitutes" in the passage subjoined. The reader should bear in mind that, in this passage and in the subsequent ones quoted, "our," "we" and "us" refer to *Americans*.

"For genuine English is no longer practically our portion, and our teaching it for every day purposes would be an anachronism. Instances are most abundant in which we have, instead of its words and phrases, substitutes for them. Of the difference in quality between such of these substitutes as are tolerable and such as should be pronounced intolerable, not many of us, however, have other than a hazy conception. By way of illustration, in the issue of the *Educational Review* for May of last year, the epithet "admirable," and with-

out discrimination of particulars, is applied to Mr. Edward Eggleston's *First Book in American History*. And "admirable," in the sense of the term now obsolete, that performance, for its corruptness of dialect, assuredly is. It is to this feature of it that, in the interest of sound and rational culture, I would invite the attention of our educationists."<sup>1</sup>

It is a curious example of Dr. Hall's processes of thought that, in his "Rejoinder," he explains "substitutes" in the foregoing passage in the following manner:

"To nothing else could I, of course, refer, by "substitutes," "tolerable" and "intolerable," than justifiable innovations, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, solecisms, gratuitous departures from right English, whether home bred or international."<sup>2</sup>

Unquestionably since Dr. Hall says so. But how was an outsider to know it? Certainly not from the *Academy* letter itself. Under "of course," as a safeconduct, there is brought in a lot of matter that (to the uninitiated) is new. In this new matter "genuine English" is displaced by "right English" carrying a bagful of different intendments; for "right English" excludes *bad* English: whereas, *bad* English may be as truly *genuine* English as *bad* wine may be *genuine* wine. The expository skill that changed "genuine English" into "right English," in so doing, changed the limitation, and therefore the sense, of "substitutes." In "substitutes" for the words and phrases of "genuine English" there is an implication of something foreign; but there is not such an implication in "substitutes" for the words and phrases of "right English": the latter substitutes might be strictly English in origin and use. If the "substitutes" for the words and phrases of "right English" were current in both England and the United States, they might (perhaps) be regarded as constituents of an international dialect, and so the quotations from Mr. Eggleston's book might illustrate—not Americanisms—but base locutions used in such international dialect. I do not deny the existence of international dialects; but that the quotations from Mr. Eggleston, in the *Academy* letter, were cited by Dr. Hall as

<sup>1</sup> *The Academy*, p. 265, col. 3.

<sup>2</sup> MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, cols. 442-3.



illustrations of an international dialect could not, I am confident, have been known without the supplementary explanations in "A Rejoinder." It is true that among the locutions censured (more than fifty) there are two (or three) that are spoken of in the letter as being used in England by the baser sort; but it would have been a most inexcusable construction of the letter to have made its drift turn on by-matter that seemed to have got into it casually: such a construction of its purport would have sacrificed all that was most distinct and prominent in it to that which was comparatively insignificant. For any doubt which the presence of those locutions might raise in the mind of a careful reader would be put to rest by matter that soon follows the comments on them—matter in which the avowal is made by Dr. Hall that, "though I have lived away from America upwards of forty-six years, I feel, to this hour, in writing English, that I am writing a foreign language,"—and especially would the reader's doubt be dissipated by the following passage:

"To return to Mr. Eggleston, it would be idle to contend that his Americanisms have not, in large share, the countenance of all our later writers of any conspicuous note, a mere handful of them, the very choicest, omitted from account. And even these Americanize in some measure."<sup>3</sup>

That a supplemental commentary was needed for the right understanding of the *Academy* letter will be evident to any one who compares that letter with the exposition of it in "A Rejoinder." I read it very carefully two or three times before writing "Not So Very American," and thought I understood it; I was conscious of difficulties in reconciling all its parts, but I believed I had succeeded in construing them not only reasonably but rightly. As one of the elements of such reasonable and right construction "our linguistic innovations," in the passage subjoined, was interpreted by me as meaning *Americanisms*:

"In so saying, I of course imply that our linguistic innovations, some of which have established themselves ineradicably, and are, in fact, indispensable, are by no means to be condemned without exception. At present,

<sup>3</sup> *The Academy*, p. 266, col 3.

however, without undertaking the defence of such of them as are defensible, I limit myself to deprecating those which are indefensible [compare with "substitutes," "tolerable" and "intolerable" previously noted], either as being entirely gratuitous or on other grounds equally valid. Of innovations of this description, which so commonly disfigure American English, the number, I repeat is very great. Manifestly, then, their diffusion and their constant increase call for grave consideration. That a duty devolves on us, in connexion with them, is what I would suggest by this slight paper."<sup>4</sup>

What could "our linguistic innovations," as used in that paragraph, mean, if it did not mean *Americanisms*? If Dr. Hall's "slight paper" was not deprecating "indefensible" Americanisms, and illustrating them by quotations from Mr. Eggleston's book, what, then, was its purport? Nobody, I am sure, could have known before the true exposition appeared in "A Rejoinder." Dr. Hall was deprecating and illustrating "gratuitous departures from right English, whether home-bred or international."—See "Rejoinder," columns 443-4 and 446.—Briefly summing up, Dr. Hall was deprecating and illustrating—not indefensible *Americanisms*—but the British-American "plebeianism" of the American international dialect.

And yet, in the *Academy* letter (p. 266, col. 3.), Dr. Hall said;

"Already, too, we [Americans] owe to it [our zeal] a *specific* character, extending in its manifold *distinctiveness*, to our speech. Circumstances generated by unprecedented combinations have entailed on us a recognizable dialect, and one which is rapidly developing,"

The italics are mine. One can see there are difficulties in that letter, even now.

R. O. WILLIAMS.

*New York.*

#### BRIEF MENTION.

A new edition of Mérimée's *Colomba* has come to us from the Cambridge University Press (London: C. J. Clay and Sons). The editor, Mr. Arthur R. Ropes, of King's College, has performed the task with much care and credit. The introduction gives a few de-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

tails about Mérimée's life and literary career, and furnishes some discussion as to the story itself. It is a matter for regret that the tale should have been abridged by some thirty or forty pages. The habit of shortening or meddling, in any manner, with original texts is seldom productive of good results, especially when applied to so closely woven a tale as *Colomba* is. A cursory glance at Chapter iii has fully convinced us of this fact. We miss the *ballata* bearing so strong a local coloring, and so effectively dramatic, referring as it does to the death of Orso's father. The dialogue between the young Englishwoman and the lieutenant is most summarily disposed of; Orso's first question is met by Miss Nevil with this curt and disobliging answer: 'Oh il nous contient une vieille histoire' and she then promptly retires to her state-room! The transition between the two last paragraphs decidedly lacks smoothness; then, we are left in ignorance of Orso's real opinion of the *vendetta*, what it is to the Corsican peasant and how practised by him, the graphic details bearing on these points having been suppressed; and yet Miss Nevil, on page 19, is made to repeat to Orso the same words that he is supposed to have uttered in the omitted part. Mérimée ends this chapter by a description first of the scenery around the bay of Ajaccio (this, Mr. Ropes incorporated in his text); then proceeds to picture to us the aspects of the city itself: the stillness of the streets, broken only by the appearance of a few idle faces, the utter absence of loud talk, laughter and singing; ominous pistol shots betraying an excited game of cards, and, at eventide, foreigners alone promenading on the Corso, whilst the inhabitants remain on the look-out on their threshold, like the falcons on their nests. These Mr. Ropes cannot call 'added details of secondary importance to the picture;' the notes are excellent, but could easily have been curtailed to make room for *Colomba's* unabridged text. The Grammar so often referred to in the notes is the *Wellington French College Grammar* by Messrs. Eve and De Baudiss, very little, if at all, in use in the United States. The English system of treating a French grammar like a Latin grammar is not in vogue in this country, and the American youth would lose both courage and patience in seeing some sixteen varieties

of dative case. The watch-word in England seems to be 'Maximum French Grammar;' here, for the time being, it is 'Minimum.'—On page 84, l. 16, the editor seems to establish a difference between 'm'avoir sauvé un coup de couteau' and 'm'avoir sauvé d'un coup de couteau,' the first meaning 'saved from stabbing,' the other 'saved from being stabbed.' The two French expressions have but one and the same meaning, both implying passivity. Moreover a careful reading of the text justifies only the passive meaning 'saved from being stabbed.'

The *Festschrift til Vilhelm Thomson fra Disciple* is a graceful tribute most richly deserved. Dr. Thomson has probably done more than any other one man to raise the standard of philological work at the University of Copenhagen to its present high state of excellence. The volume contains twenty articles on linguistic and literary subjects, ranging from a study of a guttural nasal in Urfinisch to topographical remarks on Xenophon. Of special interest to general students of literature is an account by E. Gigas of the original plan of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, which was recently discovered by him in the Thott collection of MSS. in the Royal Library at Copenhagen. Finnur Jónsson's "Fremmede ords behandling i oldnordisk digtning" is characteristically thorough and throws much light on a hitherto neglected subject. Among other articles may be mentioned V. Andersen's "Sammen fald og beröring;" O. Jespersen's "Om substraktionsdannelser;" Kr. Nyrop's "Et afsnit af ordenes liv" and P. K. Thorsens "Glidning og spring." The mechanical execution of the work is beautiful in the extreme.

#### PERSONAL.

Dr. Joseph Hendren Gorrell, who is now Professor of Modern Languages in Wake Forest College, N. C., is a graduate of Washington and Lee University (A. B. 1888, A. M. 1890), where in 1890-91 he held the office of Assistant Professor of Modern Languages. After a graduate course of three years in the Modern Languages, with English as his principal subject, at the Johns Hopkins University, he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in June, 1894. His dissertation is a study of "Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon."



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1895.

## THE TWELFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

THE twelfth annual convention of the Modern Language Association of America was held in Philadelphia, at the University of Pennsylvania, December 27-29, 1894. The Association held four independent sessions, and with six other societies,—the American Oriental Society, the American Philological Association, the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, the American Dialect Society, the Spelling Reform Association, and the Archaeological Institute of America,—it participated in three joint sessions. This is the first occasion on which the Modern Language Association has become a fraction of a larger philological unit; for the simultaneous meetings of the various societies held at Chicago in 1893 were an aggregate of integers. The program of the meetings at Philadelphia included both joint and simultaneous sessions. The common bond of union, in addition to that of closely related aims and studies, was the desire to pay tribute to the many-sided activity, and to do honor to the memory of William Dwight Whitney.

The seven societies met at twelve o'clock on Thursday, December 27, in the University Library, and listened to a brief address of welcome by the Acting Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, Mr. C. C. Harrison, who introduced the presiding officer of the first joint session, Professor Elliott, of the Johns Hopkins University, President of the Modern Language Association. Professor Elliott voiced the thanks of the Associations, and expressed the hope that the joint meetings might be indicative of "a renewed fraternal interest in all that concerns us as earnest co-workers in the special field of American letters, and in the vast cosmopolitan domain open to the furtherance and enlargement of science." He then introduced the eminent Shaksperian scholar, Horace Howard Fur-

ness, whose address was charming, both in felicitous quotation and in cordiality of welcome. "This building, this city, and our hearts, are yours. Enter, and enjoy your own."

The first independent session was called to order at three o'clock on Thursday afternoon. The report of the Secretary, which was already before the Association in printed form, was duly accepted; the report of the Treasurer was read, and was referred to an auditing committee; committees were also appointed to suggest a place for holding the next convention, and to nominate officers for the ensuing year. The first paper was read by Professor Hewett, of Cornell University, on "The Life and Works of Matthias de Vries." Professor Hewett gave a most interesting sketch of the career of the great Dutch scholar, of his life-work upon the large dictionary of the Dutch language, and of his successful efforts toward establishing a national spelling and a standard literary language for both the Northern and the Southern Netherlands. The discussion was opened by Dr. Vos, of the Johns Hopkins University, who compared de Vries to our own Professor Whitney. He dwelt upon the importance of the study of Dutch to students of Germanic philology and of German literature. Mr. de Haan, of the Johns Hopkins University, a former pupil of de Vries, recounted in a graphic manner personal recollections of the Dutch professor. He also insisted upon the importance of a knowledge of Dutch to students both of German and of English literature.

An admirably written paper was presented by Dr. Francke, of Harvard University, on "The relation of early German Romanticism to the Classic Ideal." Romanticism in its early stages, he said, was individualism run mad. He illustrated his views by a detailed analysis of Tieck's *William Lovell*, Friedrich von Schlegel's *Lucinde*, and Novalis's *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*. Professor Wood, of the Johns Hopkins University, failed to find in the paper a positive criticism, and thought that the writer's destructive criticism was based upon the weakest works of Tieck and



Schlegel. The speaker referred to Goethe's judgment upon Romanticism as set forth in the Walpurgisnachtstraum in *Faust*. Dr. Francke reminded his critic that his sketch presented only the first phase of Romanticism, and that the constructive stage would follow later.

Under the title "The Friar's Lantern," Professor Kittredge, of Harvard University, presented a brief oral communication. He effectually laid the ghost of Friar Rush, who by generations of commentators upon Milton's *L'Allegro* has been confused with the friar whose lantern is mentioned in that poem. The passage in Harsnet's *Declaration of Popish Impostures* which has been quoted for so long, can no longer be cited to interpret Milton's line. The passage in Harsnet's book was satirical, and was aimed at a real friar; Milton's friar had nothing to do with Friar Rush.

Professor Magill, of Swarthmore College, read a paper on "The New Method in Modern Language Study." The method described is largely inductive, is designed for students of college age, and has primarily in view the acquisition by the pupil of the ability to read, and of familiarity with literature. Practice in composition and in conversation is deferred until considerable progress has been made in reading the foreign language. Owing to the lateness of the hour, the discussion of this paper was deferred to the next session, the first paper of which was similar in character.

The second joint session was held on Friday morning, December 28; the presiding officer was Professor Wright, of Harvard University, President of the American Philological Association. In the program of eight papers the Modern Language Association had two representatives, Professor Collitz, of Bryn Mawr College, and Professor Sherman, of the University of Nebraska. Professor Collitz read a paper, soon to be published, on "Some Modern German Etymologies." Professor Sherman did not appear; his paper, on "Shakespeare's First Principles of Art," which had been anticipated with interest, will also be published at an early date.

At the second independent session, held on Friday afternoon, the Secretary of the Asso-

ciation read a communication by Professor Frederic Spencer, of the University of North Wales, "On a reform of methods in teaching the Modern Languages, together with an experiment in the teaching of German." Professor Spencer advocates the practice from the outset of writing a foreign language, and of speaking it in the class-room. Printed copies of practical exercises which he has used with success in his instruction were distributed among the audience. Professors Hart, (Cornell University), Super (Dickinson College), Blackwell (Randolph-Macon College), Elliott, and Magill, and Messrs. Babbitt (Columbia College) and Willner (Johns Hopkins University), took part in the discussion that followed. Emphasis was laid upon the fact that Professor Spencer's method has been tested by him only with a very small class, that it cannot successfully be employed in teaching large classes, and that methods of instruction must be varied to suit the age and capacity of pupils, the size of classes, and the particular end that the instructor has in view.

Professor A. Melville Bell, of Washington, D. C., President of the Phonetic Section, read a paper entitled "A Note on Syllabic Consonants." After defining the terms vowel, consonant, syllable, he showed that syllabic consonants (so-called) are not vowels, and that vowels are not necessary to the formation of syllables. Groups of words are the units of speech, and the secret of good reading is careful attention to phrasing. Professor Wheeler of Cornell University, was invited to open the discussion. He spoke of the debt of gratitude which all students of phonetics owe to Professor Bell, and said that the question presented by him was largely a matter of terms. We must distinguish in our use of terms between a physiological fact and a function. It is still an unsettled question whether the syllabic and the non-syllabic sounds of *l*, for example, differ from one another. Mr. John Hift, Superintendent of the Volta Bureau, at Washington, gave a short account of the Bureau, which was founded by a son of Professor Bell for the diffusion of knowledge about the deaf, especially in regard to methods of teaching to the deaf the system of visible speech of which Professor Bell is the author.

Professor Magill called attention to the fact that Professor Bell is an example of his own teaching as to the importance of distinctness of utterance and of speaking by phrases.

Professor Lang, of Yale University, in a paper on "The Metres employed by the earliest Portuguese Lyric School," enumerated the various measures found in the principal collections of the lyric poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Mr. de Haan advocated a comparative study of the lyric measures employed by early poets in Provence and in Spain; such a study of historical relations is a pre-requisite to a determination of the metres that have their origin in Portuguese poetry.

Dr. Gorrell, of Wake Forrest College, read a paper on "Indirect Discourse in Anglo-Saxon." His researches, which were based entirely upon prose writers, dealt chiefly with the sequence of tenses in modal clauses, with *pæt* and *hū* clauses, and traced the tendency toward the breaking down of subjunctival forms and the use of the direct form. The paper was discussed by Dr. Mather of Williams College.

The last paper of the session was "A parallel between the Middle English poem *Patience* and one of the pseudo-Tertullian poems," by Dr. O. F. Emerson, of Cornell University. He pointed out striking resemblances between *Patience*, which is mainly a paraphrase of the book of Jonah, and a Latin poem, *De Jona et Nineve*, formerly attributed to Tertullian. The most significant resemblance is in the description of the storm at sea, which, in both poems, is much fuller than the brief Biblical narrative; the similarity extends not only to details, but also to the order in which details are stated. Remarks upon the paper were made by Professor Bright.

The third joint session, the most largely attended of all, was the memorial meeting in honor of William Dwight Whitney: the presiding officer was President Gilman of the Johns Hopkins University, President of the American Oriental Society. Scholars from all parts of the country came in person to honor the memory of Professor Whitney; and letters were read from eminent scholars in England, France, Italy, and Germany. The principal address of the evening was by Professor Lan-

man of Harvard University, a friend and pupil of Professor Whitney, whose scholarly activity he divided into three important lines:—The elaboration of strictly technical works; the preparation of educational treatises; and the popular exposition of scientific questions. It is chiefly under the second division that there falls the work which connects Professor Whitney with the study of modern languages. The preparation of a German reader; of a German dictionary; of grammars, each in certain particulars the best of its kind, of the English, French, and German languages; the editorship of a series of German texts; an associate editorship of earlier editions of Webster's Dictionary; and the chief editorship of the Century Dictionary,—all show that though Whitney was pre-eminently a scholar in Sanskrit and in the science of language, yet he was also eminent as a worker in modern languages.

Professor March, of Lafayette College, a former president of the Modern Language Association, in a most genial and happy manner spoke of "Whitney's influence on the study of modern languages and on lexicography":—"Our great Sanskrit scholar was also an instructor in modern languages at Yale. He taught great classes of undergraduates French and German for thirty years." His grammars in English, German, and French "are perhaps the most widely used of their kind. All are remarkable books. . . . He had a profound system of language, its origin, and its development." Other addresses showed other sides of Whitney's scholarly activity, his influence upon his pupils, his character as a man. Listening to the varied testimony to the breadth and thoroughness of Whitney's scholarship, and to his nobility and dignity of character, one was reminded irresistibly of *The Grammarian's Funeral*, and of the triumphant chant of his pupils as they carried him to burial:—

"This is our master, famous, calm, and dead,  
Borne on our shoulders.

. . . . .  
Leave him—still loftier than the world suspects,  
Living and dying."

The third independent session, held on Saturday morning, December 29, opened with



an interesting paper by Mr. Schofield, of Harvard University, on "Elizabeth Elstob: an Anglo-Saxon scholar nearly two centuries ago, with her *Plea for Learning in Women*." Mistress Elstob was not only a scholarly woman, an editor of Anglo-Saxon homilies, and the writer of the first Anglo-Saxon grammar in English. She was also a woman of admirable character, and the wielder of a very graceful pen. Her *Plea for Learning in Women* is most attractive in its arch and ready wit.

Dr. Marden, of the Johns Hopkins University, read a paper on "The Spanish Dialect of Mexico City." It was based upon personal observation of the spoken language, and is interesting for the light that it throws upon the pronunciation of Spanish at the time of the colonization of Mexico. The dialect shows a marked influence of the aboriginal language of Mexico. The paper was discussed by Professors Rennert (University of Pennsylvania), Price (Columbia College), and Garner (United States Naval Academy).

Professor Ross, of the Agricultural and Mechanical College, Alabama, followed with a paper on "Henry Timrod and his Poetry"; as an appropriate sub-title the writer suggested "a study of literary conditions in the South under the old régime." Timrod's poetic work, admirable but uneven, was sympathetically criticised; the poet was likened to Collins, in that he was in his age, but not of it. The discussion was opened by Dr. Tupper, of the University of Vermont, whose early associations were with Timrod's literary circle. He agreed with the writer of the paper in attributing to the unfavorable conditions of life on a southern plantation the failure of Timrod to express himself fully in verse. Professor Garnett, of the University of Virginia, denied that the conditions of life in the South are unfavorable to the production of poetry; while Professor Price affirmed that, so far as he had been able to observe, the conditions of life everywhere,—North, South, East, and West,—are unfavorable to the production of poetry. Professor Bright cited passages in the poetry of Timrod which bear traces of the influence of Wordsworth.

At this stage in the proceedings the com-

mittee appointed to suggest a place for holding the next convention was permitted to make its report. Professor Hart reported that the committee recommend that of the several invitations received by the Association, that extended by Yale University, to meet at New Haven, be accepted. The report was adopted.

The next paper was by Professor Hatfield, of the Northwestern University, on "The Poetry of Wilhelm Müller." He characterized Müller as a pioneer in the writing of lyric cycles, as the poet of the young, and as the poet of freedom. Professor Wood spoke of Wilhelm Müller as an exponent of the Volkslied, said that in spirit and character he belongs with the Swabian school, and compared him with Hölderlin and Waiblinger. The discussion was continued by Professors Hatfield and Greene and by Mr. Willner.

Dr. Menger, of the Johns Hopkins University, read a paper on "Early Romanticists in Italy." The seeds of Romanticism were sown by Madame de Staël. The evangelists of Italian Romanticism were Berchet and Visconti, who worked together upon the journal, *Il Conciliatore*: other leading spirits were Silvio Pellico and Alessandro Manzoni. Professor Cohn, of Columbia College, called attention to the fact that in France the romanticists were strong Roman Catholics, although the impulse to Romanticism came from Protestant countries, Germany and England.

The closing session was held on Saturday afternoon. In behalf of the committee upon Honorary Members, Professor Cohn reported the names of eight European scholars who were recommended for honorary membership. The recommendation of the committee was adopted by the Association.

On the part of the committee appointed to nominate officers for the following year, Professor Greene reported the names of the following members, who were unanimously elected to the positions for which they were nominated:—

President: James Morgan Hart, Cornell University.

Secretary: James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University.

Treasurer: Marion D. Learned, Johns Hopkins University.



Executive Council:	{ Kuno Francke, Harvard University.
East.	{ Albert S. Cook, Yale University. Hugo A. Rennert, University of Pennsylvania.
West.	{ Albert H. Tolman, University of Chicago. George A. Hench, University of Michigan. John E. Matzke, Leland Stanford Jr. University.
South.	{ Alcée Fortier, Tulane University. J. B. Henneman, University of Tennessee. Charles H. Ross, Agricultural and Mechanical College, Alabama.
Phonetic Section:	{ President: A. Melville Bell, Washington, D. C. Secretary: George Hempl, University of Michigan.
Pedagogical Section:	{ President: Charles H. Grandgent, Cambridge, Mass. Secretary: James T. Hatfield, Northwestern University.
Editorial Committee:	{ A. Marshall Elliott, Johns Hopkins University. Henry A. Todd, Columbia College.

For the committee appointed to audit the Treasurer's report, Dr. Emerson reported that the accounts were found to be correct in every respect. The Secretary of the Phonetic Section, Mr. Grandgent, presented a report of the work that had been done by the section (chiefly by the secretary, it should be said) during the year. The report was approved, and the Association proceeded to the reading of papers.

Dr. Lewis, of Princeton University, presented a communication "On the development of inter-vocalic labials in the Romance languages." In discussing the paper, Dr. Menger commented upon the large number of classes made by the writer, eighty-five in all, of which only about thirty are common, and expressed doubts as to the possibility of obtaining exact results in so difficult a problem.

Dr. Rhoades, of Cornell University, followed with a paper entitled "Notes on Goethe's *Iphigenie*." He pointed out the connection between Goethe's *Iphigenie* and Friedrich Wilhelm Gotter's *Electra*, and showed that through the latter play, which is based upon

Voltaire's *Oreste*, elements which must otherwise be referred directly to a French source are sufficiently explained.

In a paper "On the Slavonic Languages" Mr. Herdler, of Princeton University, gave a summary of the results of investigation into the grouping and geographical distribution of Slavonic languages and dialects. The paper was discussed by Dr. Stollhofen, of Princeton University, and by Professor Collitz.

The last paper was on "Old French Equivalents of Latin substantives in *-cus*, *-gus*, *-vus*," by Dr. Jenkins, of Philadelphia. He showed that the difference in form between the Old French *feu* and *fucc*, *lieu* and *lucc*, is due to the difference in time of the loss of the final consonant in the nominative and accusative forms. Dr. Menger discussed the explanation given by Dr. Jenkins, and expressed the opinion that the contribution was a valuable one.

A paper by Professor Hohlfeld, of Vanderbilt University, "Contributions to a Bibliography of Racine," was read by title. This closed a series of sessions of unusual interest. The largest attendance at the independent meetings of the Associations was at the first and second sessions, nearly one hundred: some of the most interesting papers were read, and some of the most interesting discussions took place, at sessions that were less largely attended.

With the hospitality for which their city is proverbial, the citizens of Philadelphia generously fulfilled the promises made in their behalf by Dr. Furness. On each of the three days of the Convention luncheon was served in the University Library; and on Thursday evening a reception was held in the Library Building by the Provost and Trustees of the University. About two hundred ladies and gentlemen enjoyed a pleasant informal dinner at the Bullitt Building on Thursday evening. Gentlemen attending the Convention were invited to the monthly reception of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania on Thursday evening, and to a reception given by the Penn Club on Friday evening; and other courtesies were shown by private citizens to ladies attending the Convention. The University Club and the Art Club extended their privileges to all gen-

tlemen attending the convention, and the Acorn Club and the New Century Club showed similar courtesies to all ladies attending. The arrangements for entertaining so large a number of guests were admirably planned, and were most successfully carried out. A large share of the success, both in planning and in bringing to pass so intricate a program, is due to the untiring foresight and zeal of the Chairman of the Local Committee, Mr. Talcott Williams, of the Philadelphia *Press*. Before the Association adjourned, Professor Bright moved a vote of thanks, which was passed unanimously, "to the officers of the University of Pennsylvania, the local committee of arrangements, and all other organized personal service that has contributed to the entertainment of the Congress of American Philologists collectively, and to the entertainment of this Association in its separate meetings."

While the varied programs of the joint sessions were of interest, yet it cannot be said that the attendance was large, except at the Whitney memorial meeting. Classical and oriental scholars did not appear to listen closely to papers upon modern languages; nor did students of modern languages pay close attention to papers upon classical and oriental subjects. The opinion seemed to prevail, so far as the writer could discover, that simultaneous meetings are certainly enjoyable, chiefly because of the opportunities that they afford of meeting old friends; but that joint meetings are not particularly profitable, owing to the technicality of the papers presented to the various associations. This difficulty was avoided in part in the program of the joint session at which papers were read; and there was complete agreement as to the appropriateness of the joint meeting in honor of Professor Whitney. His work has been helpful to a larger number of linguistic scholars than that of any other philologist that this country has produced; and the Whitney memorial meeting brought together the largest number of men and women devoted to literary and linguistic study that has ever assembled in this country.

HERBERT EVELETH GREENE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## THE ETHICS OF TRANSLATION.

DOUBTLESS the Italians are right in dubbing every translator a traitor. But just as certainly every language student will insist that there are degrees of treason, and that the crime of the translator who really understands his author, and conscientiously thinks his thoughts after him in another language, is not to be compared with that of the irresponsible literary fiend called the "dictionary translator." If there is one principle in literary ethics that needs emphasizing, it is this: That the man who, without a perfect command of both languages, ventures to publish a translation, commits an unpardonable sin, for which there is no expiation. For he is sure to give more or less permanent form to a mere travesty on the ideas and the language of his original, and to defraud, without recourse, both the foreign author and the public.

This principle has been flagrantly violated in a translation just published, of Gustav Freytag's *Technik des Dramas*.<sup>\*</sup> It is doubly unfortunate that this work should have fallen into the hands of the Philistines, not only because of its excellence, but also because a good reproduction would be of very great value to almost every student of dramatic literature.

The present translation certainly does not offer a satisfactory reproduction; in fact, it is a classic example of "dictionary translation," full of absurd misconceptions and atrocious errors, and couched in abominable English.

A few characteristic mistranslations (only the briefest) will make evident the very limited acquaintance of the translator with the language of the original. *Der herzogliche Dragoner-Major Blasius* is translated as "Duke Blasius"; *Gesetze des Schaffens* as "laws of creation"; also as "also"; *Schauspielkunst* as "scenic art"; *bestimmtes Zeitmass* as "chosen movement"; *neuere Bühne* as "later stage," and *wir Neueren* as "we later ones"; *gewandte Dialektik* as "clever dialect"; *öffentliche Reden* as "freedom of speech"; *Romanen* as "Romans"; *ehrbare* as "reverential"; *traulich* as "credulously";

<sup>\*</sup>Freytag's *Technique of the Drama*, translated by Elias J. MacEwan. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.



*hohe langweilige Bewegung* as "stilted, tedious moment"; Shakespeare is said to have "created the drama of the earlier Teutons"; and so on, *ad nauseam*. At this rate it often happens, of course, that important passages are rendered absolutely unintelligible, or made to say just the opposite of what the author intended.

One more extract, as an illustration of the translator's style:

"The dramatic includes those emotions of the soul which steel themselves to will, and to do, and those emotions of the soul which are aroused by a deed or a course of action; also the inner processes which man experiences from the first glow of perception to passionate desire and action, as well as the influences which one's own and others' deeds exert upon the soul; also the rushing forth of will power from the depths of man's soul toward the external world, and the influx of fashioning influences from the outer world into man's inmost being; also the coming into being of a deed, and its consequences on the human soul."

No more need be said to prove that the present translation is a very unsatisfactory reproduction of Freytag's work, that it is often misleading, always unreliable. Even in this garbled form, indeed, the book will deserve a wide use, for there is no other to take its place. It is to be hoped, however, that Freytag may some day find a more successful interpreter.

JOHN S. NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

#### SOME SUGGESTED RIME EMENDATIONS TO THE YORK MYSTERY PLAYS.

In a study of the York Mystery Plays during the past winter, under the direction of Dr. Davidson of Adelbert College, my attention was often called to certain errors in the rimes. It is the purpose of this paper to give a list of these errors and to make some suggestions as to emending them.

The errors are of various kinds; errors of insertion, transposition, substitution, partial alteration, and scribal errors. The scribal errors are both dialectal and due to carelessness. Of the latter, errors of carelessness, nothing need be said, but the dialectal errors

are quite important. The plays were northern in their origin, while the scribes were often of southern birth and education. It was most natural, therefore, that a southern scribe in copying a manuscript of a play should often substitute southern forms and spellings for the old and correct northern forms and spellings.

Errors arising from substitution and partial alteration are also very important. The scribes, whenever the text did not suit their taste, took the liberty to change the verse or rime to their idea of correct verse or rime. Often whole stanzas and verses are entirely or partially re-arranged or entirely new stanzas and verses are substituted. These can generally be detected by a change from the normal four-stressed and three-stressed verses, but when the rime only has been altered, it is more difficult to find the original rime-word. They may be found sometimes by a comparison with the Woodkirk cycle, which often retains the old northern form, but more often by comparing the rime-series containing similar rimes. In all cases where emendations are suggested, I have endeavored to give a sufficient number of other rime-series, in which the same word or words occur, to verify the emendation.

The plays examined were the "parent cycle" plays as given by Dr. Davidson in his Yale thesis in 1892, that is, York ii, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xv, xvii, xx, xxiii, xxiv, xxvii, xxxv, xxxvii, xlv, and the Woodkirk play, *Conspiracio et Capito* from "Cayphas" to "Tunc dicet Sanctus Johannes."

#### EMENDATIONS.

Yii, 9. *amendid.* change to *'amende* to rime with *fende, lende, ende*. Instances of this ending in p.p. are. . .

Yix, 22. "Slyke hettyng þat him mekill amende."

Yxxxv, 128. "This boring muste all be amende."

Yii, 19. *set: firmament.* Change *set* to *sent*. The translation is—

"þe water I will be sent  
to flowe bothe fare and nere  
And þan the firmament."

It is apparently a scribal error through haste, but it may be, however, a dialectal error, but no evidence can be found. Cf. ll. 48:50; also Yxvii, 42:44.



Yii, 80. *wrothe*, change to *wrought*, to rime with *oght*, *noght*, etc. Scribal error.

Yviii, 50. *qwartte*, *garte*, *smerte*, *hert*; change *smerte* to *smarte*, and *hert* to *hart*, their northern form.

Yviii, 57. *mankynde*, *synne*, *pere-in*, *begynne*; change *mankynde* to *mankynne*. cf. Yix, 30. Yix, 163.

Yviii, 58. *wreke*, *make*, *sake*, *take*; change *wreke* to *wrake*. *wreke* is southern. Cf. *Knights Tale* 103.

Yviii, 82. *blys*, *pis*, *mysse*, *wyshe*; change *blys* to *blysse* and *wyshe* to *wisse*. Cf. Yxiii, 231-234.

Yviii, 117. *fawlde*, *talde*, *olde*, *boude*; change *olde* to *alde*, the northern form; change *boude* to *balde*. Scribal error. Cf. Yx, 41. Yxx, 45.

Yix, 251. *luke*, *for-soke*, *toke*, *weke*; change *weke* to *woke* the northern form.

Yix, 289; change *heght* to *hight*. Cf. Yxxxv, 166, Yxxxv, 229.

Yix, 303. *sawes*, *more*, *perfore*, *yore*; change *sawes* to *lore*. It is an intrusion of a southern word.

Yx, 15. *tyde*, *multyplys*, *wyde*, *circumceicyd*; change *multyplye* to, *be multyplyd*. This makes a complete rime and preserves both the sense and the metre, while the given form destroys the grammatical construction.

Yxi, 202. *kyng*, *tythyngis*; change *tythyngis* to *tythyng*. Cf. x, 49.

Yxi, 282. *emange*, *gang*, *lande*, *wrang*; change *lande* to *lang*. Cf. Woodkirk viii, 282.

"To leyde thi folk to lykyng lang."

Yxvii, 1. *lyff*, *sight*, *bright myght*; change *lyff* to *light*. Cf. line 97.

Yxvii, 19. *wroght*, *broght*, *sought*, *myght*; change *myght* to *mought* or *moght*. Scribal error.

Yxvii, 29. *by-gonne*, *sonne*, *knowe*, *fonde*; change *knowe* to *con*, Cf. xii, 168; change *fonde* to *fone*. Other instances of the p. p. spelt *fone* are. . .

Yx, 306. "That faythful ay to *pe* is *fone*."

Yx, 366. "Hir fayrer is none *fone*,"

In one instance it is spelt *fune*.

Yxxiii, 100. "Swilk ffaire be-fore was neuere *fune*."

Yxvii, 218. *not*, *wroght*, *unsought*, *moght*; change *not* to *noght* the northern form. The MS. reads *noth* which is equally incorrect.

Yxx, 50. *rawes sawes*, *knawe*, *lawe*; change *rawes* and *sawes* to their singular number, *rawe* and *sawe*. Cf. series 86-92 for correct plural rimes.

Yxx, 127-128.

"And poure haue playnere & playne to say,  
And aunswer as me awe."

The rime-series is *fayne*, *mayne*, *sartayne*, *say*. Transpose the words "to say" at end of line 127 to the beginning of line 128.

The rime-word in 127 then would be *playne*. The translated line would read similar to the Woodkirk "Pagina Doctorum," 127-128.

"And powere have I plene and playn

To say and ansivere as me aw."

Yxx, 13. *founde*, *sonne*, *boone*, *be-gonne*; change *founde* to *fone*. Cf. Yx, 306. Yx, 366.

Yxx, 153. *preve*, *loue*. This may be an example of what has already been mentioned, the riming of the final *e*. If not, the northern form would be more probably *proue*, from the O. F. *proe* from the Latin: the *o* "devient *ou* en français quand il est *bref*." The 15th century form is *proue* and thus making a rime with *loue*. The *preve* would be a southern form. Cf. Yii, 23. Yxx, 276.

Yxx, 192. *lawe*, *saies*, *wayes*, *prayeres*; change *lawe* to *layse*. Cf. Yxi, 44.

Yxx, 253. *twa*, *froo*, *soo*, *woo*; change *froo* *soo*, and *woo*, to *fra*, *swa*, and *wa*. Substitution of southern form by scribe. Other instances are found in lines 169-175: Yxxvii, 176., Yxliv, 34-36, and elsewhere throughout the plays.

Yxxiii, 60. *vnderstande*, *tythandys*; change *tythandys* to *tythande*. Cf. Yx, 49.

Yxxiii, 105.

"My bredir if *pat* *ze* be come

To make clere Cristis name,

Telles here till vs thre."

Line 105 should end with *come*, the *come* being a scribe's addition. Neither does it belong to the next line as in Yxx, 127, for it would destroy the regular three-stressed metre. It must be dropped entirely.

Yxxiii, 146. *sent*, *kende*, *lende*, *hende*; change *sent* to *sende*. Other instances of the p. p. in this form are. . .

Yxxxvii, 398.

"To solace sere *pai* schall be *sende*."

Yxliv, 71.

"panne schall it sone be sende,"

Yxxiii, 171. *affraied, grayth, saide, paied*; change *grayth* to *grayde* or *graied*. Cf. Yxii, 141., Yxxiv, 2., Yxxxv, 39.

Yxxiii, 224. *sayrenes, gesse, expresse, is*; change *is* to *es* the northern form. Cf. Yii, 45, 81. Yxxiii, 69. All of which should be *es*.

Yxxxv, 97. *nowe, brought, boght, soght*; change *nowe* to *noght*. Scribal error.

Yxxxv, 122. *handis, spende, bende, amende*; change *handis* to *hande*. This form of the plural was not unused at the time the Mystery Plays were written. Cf. Morris's *English Accidence* on the formation of the plural.

Yxxxvii, 113. *schall, principall, A, Belial*; change *A* to *Anaballe*. The *A* is merely the scribe's short-hand. Cf. Woodkirk xxv, 113.

Yxxxvii, 188. *pryde, tyde, cryed, prophicie*.

The only solution to this very irregular rime is to substitute for the line ending in *prophicie*, the 188th line from Woodkirk xxv, which reads. . .

"For of this prynce thus ere I *saide*."

This makes a correct rime-series.

Yxliv, 97. *nowe, Jesu, trewe, pursue*.

Change *nowe* to *newe*. The *newe* being used in the sense of renewed.

Yxliv, 134. *two, visita, ma, swa*.

Change *two* to *twa*, the northern form.

H. E. COBLENTZ.

Franklin College.

## THE FERRARA BIBLE.

### I

THE study of Ladino or Judaeo-Spanish must begin with the Ferrara Bible, for being printed out of Spain and primarily for Jews, it must to some extent represent the deviating forms of the language in the diaspora. So far, the Ladino has been sadly neglected, although its importance for the investigation of Old Spanish was pointed out by Böhmer. Of the two essays mentioned in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* i, 691, only Grünwald's *Ueber den Jüdischspanischen Dialekt als Beitrag zur Aufhellung der Aussprache im Altspanischen* has been accessible to me: it contains an ill-digested heap of facts and betrays the dilettante. A much better article is that by R. Foulché-Delbos: *La Transcription*

*Hispano-hébraïque*—in the *Revue Hispanique* for 1894 (Numéro 1, p. 22-34); it does what it promises: "c'est pour faciliter l'étude de ce rameau du castillan qu'a été composé le présent travail."

Considering the fact that the Ferrara Bible was simultaneously struck off for the use of Christians, its importance for the study of sixteenth century Spanish becomes at once evident. The bible was again reprinted with Roman characters in 1631, and from time to time there have issued from the Judaeo-Spanish Press in Vienna and Constantinople modernisations of the same in Hebrew type. The prayers of the Spanish Jews are mainly extracts from different passages of the Bible, and as long as they are printed in Spanish they adhere closely to the letter of the first source. The present essay is based entirely on one of these prayerbooks, kindly loaned me by Rev. Dr. S. Morais of Philadelphia. Its title is: *Orden de las Oraciones Cotidianas Por estilo seguido y corriente, Con las de Hanucah, Purim y Ayuno del Solo. Como tambien las tres Pascuas de Pesah, Sebuoth, y Sucoth, y con las Parasioth, y Aftarót. Nuevamente corregido, y à su costa Impresso en Amsterdam, por David Fernandes & David De Elisa Pereyra. Año 5488. à la Criacion. (A.D. 1727).*

The title page of the Bible claims for it that it is *palabra por palabra traduzida de la verdad Hebrayca*, and in the following introduction (*lenguaje barbaro y estraño, y muy diferente del pulido que en nuestros tiempos se usa*) is explained by the desire to follow closely the original Hebrew. Thus the present participle is frequently used without the copula for the present tense: *no por nuestras justedades nos echantes nuestra rogativa delante ti*; or the copula may be added: *seamos conocientes tu nombre y aprendientes tu Ley*. The copula is frequently omitted: *todo tiempo que la alma entre mi*; *quiera que el-hijo de firmamiento*. The adjective is often placed after the noun: *el Dio en el mundo esse*; *porque hiziste à la cosa esta*; *de ojo malo y de lengua la mala*. The possessive pronoun before a participle may have an objective meaning: *nuestros aborrecientes*; *mis vencientes*. A plural verb with



a collective noun as subject and a singular predicate when preceding a plural subject are due to Hebrew influence: *tu compañía estaban en ella; no sea à ti dioses otros delante mi*. Nouns are sometimes put in the plural as in Hebrew: *alce A. sus fazes à ti*. These few deviations and the occasional misuse of the article is all that can be directly ascribed to the influence of the Hebrew original. Yet they suffice to turn at times the text into a puzzle, especially when a Talmudical passage is translated.

Baist says (Gröber, *Grundriss* i, 702) that *b* and *v* are identical in every position and that in the Middle Ages they were used indiscriminately, while now they are misused (schulmässig ungenau). But the Ladino distinguishes between the spirant and the explosive both in writing and pronouncing, and even in the Ferrara Bible we find a consistent separation of the two consonants. Invariably we have *b*+cons. but cons.+*v* (except *mb*): *sobre nombre hablar cobdicia dubda brosladura; salvo encorvar resvalar envoluntar barvez, but combite*. Latin intervocalic *p* always gives *b*, otherwise *b* within the word changes to *v*: *recebir arriba cabeça but escrevir governar maravilla*; hence we find regularly *ava* in the imperfect of verbs in *ar*. In *v* voc. *v* the first *v* dissimulates to *b*: *bivo bolver beber* (but *bebraje*); *bivora* for *vivora* is to be explained through the intermediate form *vivora*. Initially original *b* is always preserved, and so is generally *v*, but in a few cases; as, *abolar bolatilla, v* passes to *b*. A *g* has been developed before initial *ue* and *hue*: *guesso guerfano guerto* and also *aguelo*; this *g* was probably pronounced, for it is sounded in Ladino.

Intervocalic *d* remains in the verbal endings *-ades, -edes, -ides*, but the forms *-ais, -eis*, also occur; it remains after the accent, hence the preterit of *ver* is *vide* by the side of *vistes*, hence the correct form *fiuzia* for *fiducia*. *Id* changes to *ld*: *cercalda* for *cercadla*; *tr* becomes *dr* in *cidron*.

Between *g* and *a, u* is always inserted: *gualardon quatregua*.

*M* assimilates a preceding *n*: *emmalecer conmigo* and has slipped into *trompieço*. *N* changes to *ñ* before *i* in *añidar*, and similarly in *liña* for *linea*. *Bufano* stands for *bufalo*;

*tembrar* frequently occurs for *temblar*.

*S* is written *ss* for etymological reasons in *passo fuesse criasse appressurar, fuessa pocession*, etc.; similarly in *assi assituar assosseguido*. Intervocalic *s* may have been a sonant, since *visitar* stands by the side of *vezitar, lazo* for *laso*; so too before *n* as we find *alezna* for *lesna*.

*F* is probably under literary influence in *flama*, and *ff* is etymological in *afflarse, afflito*. *H* frequently takes the place of *f*: *conhorte hulano horo (fuero)*, but it was certainly not sounded, as can be seen from *elada enchir ombro and hechar. Alharroba=algarroba*.

*X* occurs only where its etymology demands it and doubtless was sounded *ʒ* in popular and *cs* in learned words as it still is in Ladino: *dixo alexar dexar execucion*. *G* before *e* and *i* and *j* coincide in sound and are used at times indiscriminately: *linage bebraje*, but always *gentio muger*. In *agora, g* stands for *h*.

*C* before *e* and *i*; *ç* before *a o u* has only an etymological signification and coincides in sound with *s*, as is to be seen from *aciento* for *assiento, pocession*, etc. *S* before *m* and *n* and Latin *ci ce* become *z*: *hazer vezino dezir paz diezmo alezna; juyzio* is probably to be explained from *juez*, since generally *cy dy* become voiceless *ç*: *verguença alçar tercero braço*. *Sc* remains or becomes *c*: *conoscer aparecer*. Initial *ci* remains. Wherever *ç* appears for *z*, a learned form may be suspected; some irregularities occur here, but to judge from Ladino they are only graphical. In *cc* the first *c* generally disappears: *licion (leccion) aflicion aperficionar*. The *c* has also disappeared in *perfeto afflito*.

Pretonic *e* varies with *i*: *heziste hiziste, vesitar visitar, escrevir, bendiziré bendeziré* and *i* with *a* in *alabimiento*; pretonic *o* may become *u*: *pusible*. Post-tonic *e* becomes *o* in *bispora*; post-tonic *i* disappears in *estança*. *Esquadriñar* for *escudriñar* is probably due to analogy.

*Dio espirito* stand regularly for *dios espiritu*, but the plural of the first is *dioses*. Change of declension takes place in *animalia appetite culebro generancio oida*. Abstract nouns are freely formed in *-acion, -miento, -ança, -ura*: *adereçamiento alabacion perdonança amarillura segura*. Their frequent use is due to the



many verbal cognate nouns in Hebrew. Strange is the use of the feminine past participle as a noun in *occulta hecha*. Before feminine nouns with accented *a* we find both *el* and *la*. The preposition *á* is used in the direct object even before inanimate objects.

*Nos vos* are generally used instead of *nosotros vosotros*. The pronoun *él* with *de* gives *ael*. The personal pronoun is inserted between the infinitive and the future ending: *aarlosá*.

The present participle ends in *-án -ién*, in the plural in *-antes -ientes*; besides, the gerund in *-ando -iendo* occurs. The third person plural perfect of *dezir* is *dixieron*. In the second person plural of the future subjunctive *e* in *-edes* disappears: *guardardes oyerdes*. The imperfect of *hazer* is *haz* and *haze*, of *poner-pon* and *pone*. The following verbs in *guar* (=Lat. *ficare*) occur: *aboniguar abiviguarfermosiguar fruchiguar* (learned *fructificar*) *muchiguar testiguar*. A large number of words, generally active verbs, are formed with a prosthetic *a*: *alevantar apresenter arrepudiar arrodear asufrencia*, etc.

L. WIENER.

Missouri State University.

#### NOTES ON THE BEOWULF.

30.—

*penden wordum geweald wine Scyldinga,  
læof land-fruma, lange āhte.*

I PROPOSE this reading in accordance with the frequent use of *geweald* as object of *āgan* (cf. *Orosius*, p. 288, ll. 9-10, 7 *pæt hē pæs ilcan rices āhte geweald þe his wiðerwinna ær āhte*). Heyne's 'implied object' is thus substituted for *wēold* (for the interchange of *eo* and *ea*, see Cosijn, *Beiträge*, viii, 570, note to l. 1321); the suggestion of March (*Anglo-Saxon Reader*, p. 88) to read *word-onweald āhte*, 'had word-sway' is also not far astray. Kluge's *lændagas* for *lange* (*Beiträge*, ix, 188) records an act of momentary desperation, although Holder, in a presumably calmer moment, has received this figment into his text.

306.—*Gūðmōð grummon*. The emended reading *Gūðmōðe grummon* is wholly unsatisfactory; the natural meaning of *grummon* is not in accord with the spirit of the passage,

and if it be forced into the list of verbs of motion, the resulting succession of predications is a stylistic defect. I punctuate and read the passage as follows:

*Gewiton him þā fēran,—flota stille bād,  
seomode on sāle sīd-fæðmed scīþ,  
on ancre fæst; eofor-lic scionon  
ofer hlēor-bergan gehroden golde,  
fāh ond fȳr-heard, ferh wearde hēold,  
gūðmōð grimmon,—guman ðnetton,  
sigon ætsomne, oð þæt hȳ sæl timbred,  
gēatolic ond gold-fāh, ongyton mihton.*

The narrative broken off at *fēran* is resumed at *guman ðnetton*; the interjected description now becomes artistically and stylistically complete by construing *gūðmōð grummon* with the preceding half-line. But *grummon* must be changed to *grimmon* (= *grimmum*, adv. dat. (*Englische Studien* 1, 497) cf. *grimman*, l. 1543.), which is an adverbial modifier of *gūðmōð*, and *gūðmōð* in its turn qualifies the singular *ferh*: 'The boar held guard, grimly warlike of mood.' The poet has passed from the general view of the images on the helmets to the specific and lively description of the symbolic figure. The transition from the plural *eofor-lic* to the singular *ferh* is therefore necessary, and the added descriptive *gūðmōð grimmon* is highly fitting.

Readers of Mr. Earle's notes to his translation of the poem will not be unprepared to notice modern parallelisms in support of the proposed interpretation. At the gate of the Hall Farm, we are told (*Adam Bede*, ch. vi), there are "two stone lionesses which grin with a doubtful carnivorous affability above a coat of arms surmounting each of the pillars." Again,

"Very grand lodges they were, with very grand iron gates, and stone gate posts, and on the top of each a most dreadful boggy, all teeth, horns, and tail, which was the crest which Sir John's ancestors wore in the War of the Roses: and very prudent men they were to wear it, for all their enemies must have run for their lives at the very first sight of them."

Kingsley: *The Water Babies*, ch. i.

It may be added that the true significance of the verb *grimman*, made obvious by *Genesis* l. 793, is supported by one of the recently

discovered Old Saxon fragments (*vide Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, Heidelberg, 1894, p. 242, l. 3).

386-7.—

*Bēo pū on ofeste, hāt in gān,  
sēon sibbe-gedriht samod ætgædere*

Surely something has been gained in the consent of the critics to refer *sibbe-gedriht* to the *Gēatas*. But Bugge's attempt to justify *sēon* (*Beiträge*, xii, 86) will hardly meet approval, nor is the less conservative suggestion of ten Brink (*Untersuchungen*, p. 53, note: *hāt in gan(gan) (on) sæl sibgedriht*) to be regarded as anything more than an indication of the correct sense of the lines. The text has suffered in transmission, and the method of restoration is suggested by *Exodus*, l. 214: *eall sēo sibgedriht somod ætgædere*. I accordingly reduce *sēon* to *sēo*. This gives a subject in the nominative singular for *gān*. It is therefore clear that *gān* too must be changed. The metre requires a dissyllable as in l. 1645 (*Beiträge* x, 268-9, 313, 477), and the nominative subject requires a finite verb which after *hāt* must be subjunctive and introduced by *pæt* (cf. *Genesis*, l. 500: *hēt pæt pū pisses ofætes æte*). The lines may therefore be read as follows:

*Bēo pū on ofeste, hāt [pæt] in gā  
sēo sibbe-gedriht samod ætgædere*

Here *gā* (Subjunctive) is metrically equivalent to *gāē*, just as *gān* (l. 1645) is equivalent to *gāēn*. It is possible that *ga* became *gān* πρὸς τὸ ἑμμενόμενον, the plural verb looking to the implied plural of the collective *sēo sibbe-gedriht*—a possible process by which the originally singular verb came to be transmitted as a plural. The form *gān* may then have occasioned the change of *sēo* to *sēon*.

623.—*sinc-fato sealde*. The context does not favor the translation 'gave costly gifts.' Banning (*Die epischen Formeln im Beowulf*, Marburg, 1886, p. 5) rightly regards the expression as an epic formula for passing the cup ("den Becher reichen").

737.—*Ofer pā niht*. Heyne's translation of this phrase by 'die Nacht hindurch,' 'die Nacht über' represents its generally accepted interpretation; Earle is however right in translating it by 'after that night.' This meaning

and use of *ofer* is that which is noted in the Bosworth-Toller *Dictionary*, s. v. i (8). The Rubrics of the Gospels furnish many instances: e. g. Luke, v, i, *Dis [godspel] sceal on þone syxtan sunnandæg ofer pentecosten*.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

### THE ORIGIN OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IDEA OF HUMOURS.

SYMONDS, writing of Ben Jonson's time, says: "At this date humour was on everybody's lips to denote whim, oddity, conceited turn of thought, or special partiality in any person"; and again, "The word had become a mere slang term for any 'eccentricity.'" Jonson, annoyed by the inexact popular use of the word defines it—

"So in every human body,  
The choler, melancholy, phlegm, and blood,  
By reason that they flow continually  
In some one part, and are not continent,  
Receive the name of humours. Now thus far  
It may by metaphor, apply itself  
Unto the general disposition:  
As when some one peculiar quality  
Doth so possess a man, that it doth draw  
All his effects, his spirits, and his powers,  
In their confusions, all to run one way,  
This may be called a humour."

To fix the source and trace the growth of this use, now practically obsolete, has the difficulty common to all such study; first, lack of material bearing directly upon the history of humours and second, the necessity for a wide view of the times in order to fix this subject in its right relation to other phenomena. We have of course two possible sources for the seventeenth century idea of "humours," as mirrored in the characters of Ben Jonson's plays. It may be a native English growth or it may be transplanted from foreign shores. If we say it is simply a modification of the personified virtues and vices of the Moralities and Interludes of the early sixteenth century we gain little, for it is probable that the Moralities and Interludes came from France, and the problem is by that hypothesis only transferred to French soil.

It is doubtless, in the sixteenth century that we must look for hints as to the origin of



Jonson's "humours"; but let us first look for a moment at a form of literature which appeared in England in the seventeenth century and which is so closely connected with our subject that the two may, perhaps, be considered as one, that is, the Character writing of which Jonson himself gives us brief examples in the characters prefixed to *Every Man out of His Humour*. This kind of composition was remarkably frequent in the first thirty-five years of the seventeenth century, a period coinciding with the working years of Jonson's life. In these years were published the seventy-six Characters of Earle's *Microcosmography*, the seventy-nine of Overbury, twenty-eight by Joseph Hall, forty-nine by Nicholas Breton, and collections by Saltonstall, Parrott, Minshull, Stephens, and others; beside anonymous collections, such as the *Surfeit to A.B.C.; Whimzies*, and *Micrologia*.

Examples of this kind of writing occur in England as early as 1567, when Thomas Harmon published his twenty-four Characters; and as late possibly as 1680, in the eighty-four of Samuel Butler.

In these Characters we have only another presentation of the Humours, as Jonson calls them, and their simultaneous appearance and wide popularity are significant and interesting, particularly as they die away together at the end of the seventeenth century.

Is there any influence bearing on the last half of the sixteenth century which may account for this popularity, and which at the close of the seventeenth century ceased to act?

Two thousand years ago in Greece, Character writing was perhaps the fashion too. In the works long known as Aristotle's are included some character sketches so like those of two hundred years ago that they might be by the same hand; and Theophrastus, Aristotle's pupil and favorite, wrote what he called *Ἠθικὰ χαρακτῆρες*.

We have only to prove that these Greek models were first brought to the notice of the English in the sixteenth century and that they became widely known and popular to find, not only the probable origin of English Character writing, but also the origin of the popular idea of Humours, which Jonson crystalized for us.

If Greek was known to the English before the Middle Ages, it seems to have been used only in the service of religion and in the study of the Testament in the original.

"By a knowledge of Greek when we find it asserted of a mediæval theologian," says Hallam, "we are not to understand an acquaintance with the great classical authors, but the power of reading some petty treatise of the fathers, an apochryphal legend, or at best some of the later commentators on Aristotle."

Whatever knowledge the English may at one time have had, died out; and the schools, though teaching the logic of Aristotle, received it through a Latin translation and applied it to theological disputations. When the Renaissance came to Europe breaking up the church influence, with which logic was then associated, and turning men's minds to other kinds of learning, and to Aristotle's other works, Aristotle was still all in all. What is true of England in this, is true, with modifications, of all western Europe.

In 1423, John Aurispa, of Sicily, brought to Italy two hundred and thirty-eight manuscripts from Greece. It was the first notable step. Filelfo followed with more, in 1427. In 1453, after the capture of Constantinople, many Greeks came to Italy, and in the middle of the fifteenth century it was recorded as a matter of special note that two learned Greeks translated certain ancient works into Latin. Cardinal Bessarion undertook Theophrastus and parts of Aristotle, and John Argyropulus the works of Aristotle. A Greek grammar was written by Lascaris, 1476, others followed: Craston's Lexicon appeared in 1480; and, in 1510, Erasmus was teaching Greek at Cambridge, though he had only a few pupils and his instructions were confined to the grammar. A Latin translation of the *Ethics of Aristotle* was printed, for the first time in England, in 1479, at Oxford. So we may fairly conclude that England at large knew nothing of Theophrastus and little of Aristotle before the opening of the sixteenth century.

But soon after that the new learning met an enthusiasm which overwhelmed every other branch of learning. Hallam speaking of the years between 1520 and 1550 says: "What the doctors of the Middle Ages had been to



theology, that was Aristotle in all physical and speculative science."

"To the conspicuous cultivators of polite literature he was indebted for appearing in a purer text and in more accurate versions, nor was the criticism of the sixteenth century more employed on any other writer."

So we are not surprised to find in the Autobiography prefixed to the Diary of Mr. James Melville, who was sent to St. Andrews College in his fourteenth year: "I . . . enterit under the regenterie of . . . Mr. Wilyeam, who haide the estimation of the most solid and learnit in Aristotle's Philosophie." The works of Aristotle were his principal text books and in the third year of his course he takes "the fyve buikis of the Ethiks and the aught buikis of the Physiks."

Harrison, a writer of the times complains of the laziness of "rich mens sons" who "study little but histories and dice and trifles"; and we are told that in 1565 Elizabeth makes orations, at the Colleges, in classic tongues; "To the great comfort of all such as have been students there"; and Ascham says, that Edward VI. read the Ethics in Greek. Some indirect evidence of this devotion to Greek is given by Ben Jonson, whose characters when they wished to be fine pretend to Greek learning. Notice Clove in *Every Man out of His Humour*.

Since, then, we find the period of the highest popularity of Greek study in England to coincide with that of Character writings, and of popular discussions of Humours, as in Ben Jonson, may we not infer that the writers of that day sought to please a public taste which recognized no model but Aristotle by copying the lighter of the works attributed to him, bringing them up to date, if I may use the expression.

It is of interest to notice further that this style of writing went out of fashion at precisely the time when doubt and discredit were brought on Aristotle by physical discoveries. A new science and a new philosophy, represented to us by the names of Galileo, and Newton, Bacon, and Descartes, Harvey, and Kepler, arose, and interest in Greek learning wanes first when the Character writings are fewer and fewer and the allusions to Humours more difficult to find.

The idea of humours was not confined to England; the term itself is used, for instance, in the introductions prefixed to the plays in earlier editions of Molière. (They sound indeed much as if written for Ben Jonson's plays.) Rabelais uses the word in the title of a short poem. La Bruyère (1639-1696) translated the *Ἠθικοὶ χαρακτῆρες* of Theophrastus and wrote Characters of his own.

A careful examination of the literature of France and Germany for this period would probably show a rise and fall of Character and Humour writing commensurate with that in England, and would add to the evidence as to the source of a fashion which, though apparently a trifling thing, brings us into immediate touch with the great Renaissance movement.

M. A. HARRIS.

New Haven.

#### THE VERB IN THE "MORTE D'ARTHUR."\*

PROFESSOR HEMPL, in his article on my *Inflections and Syntax of Malory's Morte d'Arthur*, has printed from Doctor Norton's unpublished verb-lists several valuable corrections of my own lists. He adds some questions which the present paper aims to answer. It should be said, however, that citations are given in my grammar, (1) for rare forms, (2) to show which of two parallel forms is the more common. Further citation seemed unnecessary and cumbrous. The following notes proceed in the order of Professor Hempl's article.

##### REDUPLICATING VERBS, §133.

*drede*. The double forms for the preterit of this verb are cited among weak verbs at §163. This is the rule wherever a verb was found to have passed over entirely to the weak conjugation. For this reason the verbs *bowe*, *flee*, *lese*, *lye* (to speak falsely), *shote*, cited by Doctor Norton, are omitted from Class ii, and *brenne* from Class iii. And since these verbs except in sporadic forms, were weak even in Chaucer, they are not mentioned at §153.

##### THE WEAK VERBS, §§162, *seq.*

*causeth*, 344, 35 may be plural, (cf. Chaucer

\*See MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, p. 479.

*House of Fame*, i. 35) or it may be a case of anacoluthon due to the interposition of the singular noun *Launcelot*, or to the taking of the whole preceding phrase as a clause.

*dare*, 192.34, is subjunctive, as always in conditional sentences. *Darest* would be ungrammatical.

#### THE STRONG VERBS.

##### CLASS I, §135.

2 *strade*, in *bestrade*, 860.6.

2 *droofe*, 700.18, occurs also at 179.12. The commoner form *drofe* occurs at 156.3, 193.17, 691.11, 695.3, 710.3, etc.

3 *wreton*, 614.2, has an ending not found elsewhere. A typographical error is to be suspected.

##### CLASS II, §137.

2 *chosen*, 663.20. The plural *-en* is discussed, in its place, at §187.

2 *clafe*, 693.21, is the common form: 197.22, 198.23, 199.5-9, 220.25, etc. [*Clefte*] occurs at 174.1.

2 *flay*, 689.13. I confess that I doubted this preterit because of the curious sense it seemed to make: *and [he] putte a spere forth, and smote the fyrste that he flay to the erthe*. Taking the *that*-clause as adjective instead of consecutive, it was easy to suppose *slay* by a printer's error of *f* for long *s*. The meaning then would be 'the first that he hit.' But a preterit *slay* was as difficult as a preterit *flay*, Malory's forms being *slewe* (*slough*) and *flewe*. Halliwell (*Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*), indeed, prints a Chaucerian preterit *flaie*, but gives no citations. That Malory's *flay* is, however, from (*flye*) seems to be proved by the following from Halliwell, under *fley* (a common Chaucerian preterit):

"Grete strokys the yeant gafc,  
And to the erthe fley his stafc."  
*MS. Cantab. ff. ii, 33, f. 64.*

Will some one give me information concerning this poem, and at the same time, perhaps, cite a Chaucerian preterit *flay*?

##### CLASS III, §141.

1 *flynge*, 589.31; 2 *flang*, pl., 192.1.

2 *swange*, 294.21, cited in foot-note to p. 40.

3 *wonne*, 193.5, 231.6, 235.1, 134.13.

##### CLASS IV, §147.

2 *bere*, 713.24.

*broke*, 258.28, is not preterit, but participle.

2 *come*, 270.28, 699.1.

2 *ware*, 468.27, occurs also 851.31.

##### CLASS V, §149.

2 *yaf*. Doctor Norton seems to be right in his assumption that this occurs only in *foryaf*, 43.32.

2 *saw*. 204.35.

##### CLASS VI, §150.

2 *forsoke*, 212.13; 3 *forsaken*, 854.38.

2 *shoke*, 694.35, 849.19.

2 *wasshe*, pl., 550.19, cited in foot-note.

2 *wake*, in (*a*)*wake*, 848.9.

Citations for the presents *shyne* (i.), *rynge*, *stynge* (iii.), *forsake*, *shake*, *wasshe* (vi.), I have not with me at present. But these are the less important as being, with the single exception of *wasshe*, sufficiently vouched for by other verbs of their respective classes.

It remains for me to thank both Professor Hempl and Doctor Norton.

CHARLES SEARS BALDWIN.

Columbia College.

#### ON THE ORIGIN OF *ī* AND *ū* IN AORIST-PRESENTS IN GER- MANIC.

In an article in PBB. xviii, 522 ff., Hirt seeks to explain the *ī* and *ū* in aorist-presents as due to the disappearance of a nasal. He gives the following instances:

1. O.E. *belife*, O.H.G. *belibu*: Skt. *lim-pāmi*, Lith. *limpū*.
2. Goth. *fra-weitip*: Skt. *vindāti*.
3. O.E. *sniweð*: Lat. *ninguit*, Lith. *sninga*.
4. O.E. *smūgan*; Lith. *smunkū*.
5. O.E. *pūte*: Skt. *tundāte*, Lat. *tundit*.
6. W.G. *wigan*: Lat. *vincō*.
7. O. E., O.H.G. *sīgan*: Skt. *siñcāti*.

Now as these aorist-presents all belong to the *ei-* and *ey-* series, and correspond to forms in allied languages with a short vowel or a nasal-infix, he assumes that in these series, *in* and *un* > *ī* and *ū* > *ī* and *ū*.

No reason can be given why, in an unaccented syllable, Germ. *inx* < *enx*, or *unx* <

*ux*, or any other vowel+nasal, should not have developed in the same way.

However we will examine the theory as given by Hirt.

To the list given by Hirt we must add the following since they come under his law.

1. Goth. *hneiwan* < √ *knehīg-* or *kneīg-*. Here we have the long vowel together with the indication, according to Sievers' law, of suffix-accentuation. According to Hirt, therefore, this *i* must be due to compensative lengthening. Cf. O.E. *sniweð*.

2 O.N. *klifa*, O.H.G. *chliban*: O.H.G. *chlimban*. √ *gleiþ*. Here also we have an aorist-present.

Further we may add the following, though neither Verner's nor Sievers' law gives us any light.

3. Got. *deigan*: Lat. *fiŋgō*- √ *dheīgħ-*.

4. O.E. *migan*, O. N. *miga*: Lat. *mingo*. √ *meigh*.

5. O.H.G. *blihhan*, O.E. *blican*: N.H.G., Mid. E. *blinken*.

6. O.H.G. *strihhan*: Lat. *stringō*, Lith. *stringu*.

7. Goth. *beitan*: Lat. *findō*.

8. O.E. *slidan*, M. H. G. *sliten*: O.H.G. *slintan*, Goth. *fra-slindan*.

9. O.H.G. *glizzan*, O. S. *glitan*: M. H. G. *glinzen*.

10. O.H.G. *slifan*, O. E. *to-slipan*: O. N. *sleppa* < \**slimp-*.

These are not the only verbs that would come under Hirt's law. In the same way we should be forced to explain the *ū* in O.E. *slūpan*, *sūpan*, *dūfan*, *scūfan*, *lūtan*, *hrūtan*, *strūdan*, *brūcan*, *lūcan*, *sūcan* and *sūgan*, *būgan*, not to mention similar verbs in the other dialects.

In this class would belong also the verbs that have restored the diphthong by analogy of other verbs in the same ablaut-series. Such verbs would be O. N. *smiūga*, O. H. G. \**smiogan*, since these must also have been aorist-presents, as is shown by the *g* as compared with the *k* of Lith. *smukti*. Other examples of the same kind, to mention no more, are: M.H.G. *biogan*, Goth. *biugan*, cf. O.H.G. *buhil*; and O.H.G. *scioban*, Goth. *skiuban*, cf. O.H.G. *scūvala*.

We shall have difficulty in referring all these to the nasal-infix class.

But to make the matter certain there are actually verbs derived from roots with *ei* that have retained the nasal-infix. Some of these have already been given in the examples above, viz., N. H. G., Mid. E. *blinken*; O. H. G. *slintan*, Goth. *fra-slindan*; M. H. G. *glinzen*; O. N. *sleppa*. Furthermore we have: Got. *siggan*, √ *seiğ-*. Cf. O.H.G. *seihhen*, and the by-form of the root *seiğ-* in O.H.G. *sihan* and *siġan*. (Cf. No. 7 in Hirt's list).

Goth. *stiggan*, √ *steiğ-*, cf. Lat. *in-stig-are*.

Goth. *windan*, √ *weiğ+t-*, cf. Skt. *vī-tās*.

O.H.G. *swintan*, √ *s eiğ+t-*, cf. O.H.G. *swīnan*.

Finally we may add that if Germanic had been so averse to retaining the nasal where it originally belonged, it would not have generalized the nasal-infix. And yet we find that, with the one exception of *standan*, the nasal-infix, where occurring, is found in all forms of the verb.

If we admit that in these aorist-presents the vowel of the stem was originally short, how shall we explain its present length? The fact that the *i* and *ū* occur only in the *ei-* and *eu-*series ought to help us to a solution. We nowhere find a form corresponding to a Gothic \**geitan*, but always to a *gitan*; though in all the other languages in which the same verb occurs there is a nasal-infix: Grk. *χαρδάνω*, Lat. *pre-hendō*, Alb. *ġendem*, Let. *gidu* (< *gendu*), Lith. *gendū*. So we shall not need to start with forms with a nasal-infix.

Now in some of the verbs at least there was probably a short vowel, as Hirt assumes for all of them.

From a Germanic *weiğō* we have O.H.G. *ubarwēhan*, O.E. *wēgan*, O.N. *vēga*, O.Norw. *viga*. These have gone over to the fifth ablaut-series. By the side of these occur W. G. *wigan* and Gothic *weihan*. If now with Osthoff, PBB. viii, 291 we say that the *h* in *weihan* arose from the perfect, and that originally there was only *weiğō*, and certainly the *h* in O.H.G. *ubar-wēhan* cannot be original; then we may infer that in *wigan* the *i* has been introduced from the regular type just as the diphthong was brought into Goth. *biugan*, *skiuban*, etc. The same thing may have taken place in other verbs, of which double forms have not been preserved.



In other cases the long vowel was without doubt original. This would be the case at least where the roots contained the long diphthongs *ēi* and *eu*; for here certainly the *tiefstufe* might be *i* and *ū*. Cf. Joh. Schmidt, KZ., 26, 13ff., Wilhelm Schulze, KZ., 27, 420ff., Per Persson, *Stud. z. L. v. d. Wurzelerw.*, p. 117.

Such may be the origin of *ū* in O.E. *pāte* and others. This would furnish a type after which other verbs might be modeled. A further move in this direction would bring in the diphthong, and this we have in O. E. *pēotan*, O.H.G. *diozan*, etc. After all, however, it is simpler to start with *i* and *ū* as the "nebentonige tiefstufe" of *eī* and *eu*.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

#### FRENCH DRAMA.

##### *Die Vergleiche in Montchrestiens Tragödien.*

Ein Beitrag zur inneren Geschichte des französischen Dramas im xvi Jahrhundert von Dr. SIGMUND SCHOLL. Nördlingen: 1894. 8vo, 68 pp., 1.20 M.

IN limiting his study of Montchrestien to the figures of speech, the comparisons or the similes of the dramatist—all of which seem included under the title of *Vergleiche*—the author has chosen the most pleasing side of the subject, and has attained results none the less interesting and suggestive. Possibly the dependance of one writer on another, the influence exerted by a master on his pupil, is most clearly shown by the language, and more particularly by the figurative language, in which the thoughts of the two are expressed. For ideas are universal, the product of the environment, and plots may be made common property by the literary generation which may have given rise to them. The phrases of conversation and exhortation are also more or less the same, obligatory and conventional. But the use of similes is something more personal and individual, peculiar to the rearing and education, and the intellectual sympathies of the man.

The object, then, in making a catalogue of Montchrestien's comparisons and figures of speech, is to fix his place in the order of liter-

ary descent, and thereby ascertain who were his literary ancestors. Scholl, however, does not content himself with the accomplishment of this task alone; but having once undertaken his investigation, he supplements it with a bibliography of his subject which must be fairly exhaustive, comprising as it does the titles of upwards of one hundred articles. His main theme is furthermore prefaced by a critical review of the more important notices of Montchrestien, from the allusions in Malherbe down to the biographies of the present school of critics.

After this introduction comes the classification of the material offered by Montchrestien's dramas. As might be inferred, nature and physical phenomena claim here a large part of the similes and comparisons, while the vegetable, mineral and animal kingdoms come in for their share. Man also in his various attributes is responsible for not a few, while pastoral and sea-faring life, mythology and history and even manufactured articles, furnish their quota. In all, some two hundred comparisons testify to the richness of Montchrestien's imaginative language.

Having enumerated the number and kind of similes, it is now incumbent on our author to discover by means of them the relation which they may have to like expressions in the works of previous dramatists and writers. Garnier, whose disciple Montchrestien is assumed to be, is naturally the first to enter into comparison. Many correspondences in figurative expressions show the close connection between him and his follower. Next in importance is Homer, whether directly, or indirectly through Virgil and Garnier. At this point an interesting fact is established by Scholl, which proves that Montchrestien did not read Homer in the original. A comparison of the French writer's *Hector* with Hugues Salel's translation of the *Iliad* (Scholl's reference is to an edition of Salel published in 1574) shows that this version was the dramatist's source of information. Even the phrases are almost identical in the two volumes.

Other assumed progenitors of Montchrestien do not offer so many facilities for comparison in the matter of similes. Trissino's

*Sophonisba* contains but few of them, and its French translation by Mellin de St. Gelais, though more poetic in this respect, offers but three possible likenesses to its later rival. In the same way Rivaudeau's *Aman* (1560) seems to have exercised no influence over Montchrestien's tragedy of the same name; nor did the Bible, from which was drawn the material for this play and also for the tragedy of *David*, contribute to them any figures of speech. This statement is also true of Plutarch and Livy, who supplied the subject for Montchrestien's *Lacènes* and *Sophonisbe* respectively. The French playwright appears entirely independent of them all, saving for the substance of his plots. Singularly enough Scholl makes no allusion whatever to Seneca's tragedies, so prolific in rhetorical phrases and figures of speech. Inasmuch as this Latin writer was the guide and model for all Renaissance tragedy, and was faithfully followed by Garnier in plot and expression, the silence of our author regarding his possible influence on Montchrestien is somewhat unexpected.

After having answered these leading questions, Scholl takes up the subordinate one of the difference between the two editions of Montchrestien's works, which were published in 1601 and again in 1603. He finds that the plays which appeared in both editions have been worked over in the second, and so decidedly transformed that the revision would seem to have been made from memory and not after the original text.

The fondness of his dramatist for figures of speech reminds Scholl of Homer's style, and suggests to him to add to the epithet of "lyric" and "dramatic" the further and more characteristic one of "epic," as illustrative of Montchrestien's manner. Was he more "epic" than Seneca who patterned his tragedies so closely on the great tragic writers of Greece? Our critic perhaps did not ask himself this question. But he affirms that Montchrestien is superior to the tragic writers of France, in this matter of comparisons and similes, and that the fashionable language of the court under the two Louis, and the development of the dramatic element, circumscribed most rigorously the freedom of Corneille and Racine. Surely the play intended for the spec-

tator must have demanded a greater amount of action and happenings than the poem written for the reader. Lyric effusions and imaginative periods would appeal but occasionally to the restless occupants of the pit, and so it was that free simile yielded to hampered metaphor with the popular playwrights of the seventeenth century.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

### OLD ENGLISH.

*A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary for the Use of Students.* By JOHN R. CLARK HALL, M. A., Ph. D. Sm. 4to, pp. xvi., 369. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894.

DURING the past twenty years, no need has been more strongly felt among students of the English language than a dictionary of Old English, which should approach completeness. Many excellent vocabularies and glossaries have appeared, dealing with a few texts; but, with the exception of the great 'Sprachschatz' of Grein (1861-64), we have no really scientific work covering the whole alphabet, and based on a considerable number of texts.

Dr. Hall has produced a dictionary embracing all the words, with the exception of proper names and some rare words from the glosses, contained in the various lexical works which have appeared up to date, and has added to these a number of words from unglossaried texts, though, as yet, this work has not been done exhaustively. He claims to have thus introduced more than two thousand words which are not found in Bosworth-Toller, so far as it has been issued.

Among the most important features of the book are the following:

1. The arrangement is strictly alphabetical, with *ð* treated as a separate letter, after *t*.
2. The only diacritical mark used is the macron. The long diphthongs have the macron over the first vowel. This is the only large dictionary in which the mark is correctly placed.
3. The standard of spelling is the Early West-Saxon, with Cosijn as ultimate authority. But here Hall differs from his predecessors in that he inserts only forms which actually



occur. Thus, if a word is not found in the Early West-Saxon manuscripts, the Late West-Saxon form is given, and if this is wanting, recourse is had to a dialectic form. To complete the confusion, Dr. Hall goes on to say, 'this plan has not always been adhered to.' He has sought to exclude all normalizations, but cannot hope to have succeeded, 'as they swarm in some of the glossaries on which the dictionary is founded.'

This is, without doubt, the feature of the book which will be most often called in question. The author offers, in defence of his course, the following arguments:

(a). Normalization is common in glossaries, and this new arrangement will give the student 'another string to his bow.'

(b). By taking a spelling which really occurs, and, of a number of actual forms, the most common one, the necessity of looking in two or more places for a word is in large measure obviated.

(c). To help to 'counteract the drawbacks' of his plan, all the variants of the root-vowel of simple words have been placed in parentheses against the head-form; the student is thus enabled to find all the compounds, no matter what their vowel may be.

Undoubtedly, Dr. Hall's plan has aided him in condensing the work into 369 pages—an end, by the way, which seems to have been continually kept in view—; and its practical value, in many instances, cannot be denied. But it gives to his pages an utterly unscientific and confused appearance, and greatly lessens the value of the book for any other purpose than that which, after all, is of prime importance,—to serve as a means of translating Old English.

Two examples of this confusion may suffice: on page 81, we have *egsa*, *ēgsa*=*egesa*, *ēgesa*. These words, *egsa* and *ēgsa*, are not as would appear, equivalent forms, but come from entirely separate roots: *egsa*, from *ege*, 'terror'; *ēgsa*, from a root kindred to that of *āgan*, 'to own.' On page 197, appear *lātēow*=*lātēow*. *lātēwestre*, sf. 'guide, conductress.' *Æ*. [*lātēow*.] These are precisely parallel words; but, no account of the greater frequency of occurrence of one or the other form, this ridiculous separation of them has been made.

4. All words occurring in the Alfredian manuscripts have been marked A O. (*Orosius*), C P. (*Cura Pastoralis*), or Chr. (*Chronicle*), as the case may be.

The forms which appear in *Ælfric* are often marked *Æ*; many of those confined to the poetry are designated by a dagger, and some dialectic forms are denoted by N, M, A, or K. But this marking is confessedly incomplete.

5. Numerous references are made to Cook's translation of Sievers's *Grammar*, and to the Grammatical Introduction to Sweet's *Reader*. These are quite full and must be very helpful to the student. They explain points of both phonology and inflection.

6. An unusually large number of cross-references are given. All the parts of strong verbs which differ from the infinitive, and occasional peculiar case-forms of nouns and pronouns, are inserted separately. This will be a great boon to the elementary student. Many, though not all, variations of spelling have been noted. Sometimes this seems superfluous; as (p. 81), *ēgland* and *ēglond*, both referring to *īgland*. Again a perplexing form is omitted, as *geunrōtian* (= *geunrōtsian*) *Ælfc*. Hgl. 4, 295; *undersfæncge* (= *undersfeng*), Hgl. 12, 46.

7. Four tables are given at the beginning of the book, which are expected to compensate for any shortcomings farther on. These contain, respectively, the vowel sounds in stressed syllables in the various dialects: normalizations used in the dictionary, with the forms which they replace (as *be-*, for *bi-*, *big-*); the ablaut-series of the various classes of strong verbs, in Germanic, Gothic, Icelandic, and Old English; and an index to the ablaut and umlaut vowels found in the parts (other than the four principal ones; e. g., 3rd person singular, present indicative) of strong verbs.

The chief faults of the book, other than those already pointed out, are

1. No compound words are divided into their elements; all words are printed without any division into syllables. And yet prefixes and other initial components are often entered separately.

2. No derivations are given. Occasion-



ally, some etymologically connected form is added in parenthesis, but without a word to explain its relation to the form under definition. It may be the Old English root-word, another word from the same root, or a cognate in one of the other Germanic languages. In the selection of these cognates, moreover, no system has been followed; any word which chanced to occur to the writer has apparently been set down. Modern English forms, which would be of great interest and assistance to the student, are very rare. When the translation is the modern form of the same word, the fact is not made known by any change in the type, or other visible sign.

3. No references to texts are given, other than the general ones to Alfred and Ælfric, mentioned above, except in the case of words which occur only once, or have never before been included in a dictionary.

However, these faults are of minor importance. The book is, on the whole, a very useful one, especially since the larger and more scientific Bosworth-Toller *Dictionary* is still incomplete. It contains many more words than any other work of the sort; the definitions are very concise, but excellent; and the book will supply a need which has been deeply felt on both sides of the Atlantic. It is to the elementary student for whose use it was especially prepared, that it will be of the greatest service.

Until the appearance of something better, we can recommend Dr. Hall's book as the most complete and generally handy Dictionary of Old English for elementary use.

FRANK H. CHASE.

Yale University.

#### ICELANDIC GRAMMAR.

*Beyging Sterkra Sagnorða í Íslensku.* JÓN THORKESSON hefir samið. Reykjavík: 1888-94. pp. xii+vii+576. 8o.

THE present book, a reference collection of the inflectional forms of strong verbs in old and new Icelandic, is one of the most important contributions, on account of its breadth and reliability, that has yet been made to the detailed history of the Icelandic language. Its plan is to give all verbal forms with reference

citation, first in the older language, that is Old Norse, and then in recent Icelandic. References for the older period are collected, where possible, from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and where they are not at hand from the fifteenth century, not only from Icelandic, but from Norwegian sources. For the later period, the majority of forms are taken from the nineteenth century. The list of sources includes more than two hundred titles.

The strong verbs have persisted in Icelandic in a remarkable degree. Of one hundred and ninety-nine verbs in Old Norse (not counting verbs like *gnúa*, *snúa*, *gróa*, *róa*, *ljá* (*léa*), *ljá*), no less than one hundred and sixty-six have come down in a strong form to new Icelandic, although some of them; e. g., *geyja*, *gnesta*, *hnjósa*, *slyngva*, *spærna* are notably defective. Six verbs; viz., *bjarga*, *fregna*, *spýja*, *tyggja*, *verpa*, *þvá*, have in the present language in part strong and weak forms. Fifteen verbs have gone bodily over to the weak conjugation; they are: *blanda*, *blikja*, *blóta*, *falda*, *feta*, *freta*, *gala*, *gnaga* (N. I. also *naga*), *hjálpa*, *hnjóða*, *mala*, *rista*, *rita*, *skepja*, *þryngva* (N. I. *þrengja*, *þröngva*). *Blanda*, however, has both strong and weak forms in the p.p.; *rista* has sometimes a strong pret. and p. p., as has also *rita*; *þröngva* has a strong p.p. as adj.; *blikja*, *gala*, *hjálpa*, *mala*, *skepja* have strong forms in poetry. *Klá* has been replaced by the weak verb *klóra* in the same signification. Ten verbs have no forms given in New Icelandic; they are: *bella*, *fisa*, *gnella*, *hnyggja*, *hnöggva*, *hrjósa*, *serða*, *siða*, *snúva* (*snýja*), *svipa*. All, with the single exception of *siða*, are notably defective in Old Norse.

The list of strong verbs in New Icelandic, on the other hand, exhibits gains over that of Old Norse in several instances. *Kviða*, which is throughout weak in Old Norse, is weak in New Icelandic in the present but strong in the past tenses. *Sviða* in Old Norse as transitive is strong, as intransitive, however, it is weak; in new Icelandic it is strong in both uses. Three verbs, no forms of which are cited from Old Norse, have in New Icelandic a strong conjugation; they are: *hnjóta*—*hnaut*—*hnjótið*, *kleipa*—*kleip*—*kleipinn*, *smella*—*small*—*smollinn*, the last one of which has

been accidentally omitted from the table of contents on p. xi.

The book, whose contents here are simply indicated, is a most painstaking and comprehensive piece of work that should serve as material in many directions. When the history of the Icelandic language shall be ultimately written, the present collection of verbal forms will furnish ready material for an important chapter.

WM. H. CARPENTER.

Columbia College.

### ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

*The History of the English Language.* By OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON, A.M., Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and English Philology in Cornell University. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894.

THE growing interest in English philology has manifested itself in the production of three new works upon the history of the English language. Mr. Champneys, writing in England and yielding to the demands of the English student, has introduced into his *History of the English Language* a great deal that is local in character and usage. Chiefly in the closing chapters of the book have the dialectal forms been treated in such a manner that the reader, however studious he may be, loses himself in a tangle of historical data and colloquialisms. Nevertheless the informal presentation of the Protean nature of the English language in its old home is novel and attractive to anyone who is more or less familiar with the various dialects and the dialectal literature of England.

A second work more historical in its arrangement is the revised and enlarged edition of Professor Lounsbury's *English Language*. This work has been enlarged to the extent of one hundred and fifty pages and improved on almost every page. A few errors still remain, and the mode of presenting the subject has been unfortunately left unchanged. At a glance one may see that an historian of the English language has two paths open to him: one, following the order of time; the other, the order of some particular topic, as the noun or verb, through the whole history of the

language. It is true, however, that neither of these paths can be followed closely without danger. Most writers have preferred a compromise between the two. Professor Lounsbury has preferred this and has so successfully pursued it that we are charmed with it all, except the starting point. And here, why could we not have had an outline of the two great laws that have determined so many of the leading characteristics of the English language? We refer to the laws of Grimm and Verner. Though these laws are not strictly English, they are to the language in its course of development what the law of gravitation is to the construction of a house. Most students pass from the architecture of Latin and Greek forms into that of English. If they have the rule and plumbline of Grimm and Verner, they are better builders.

Such an equipment Dr. Emerson has provided. And this third book upon the history of the English language is the one concerning which I wish to speak at greater length. Dr. Emerson has written a practical text-book which presents an admirable arrangement of the growth of the language historically, together with an outline of the fundamental principles upon which this development has taken its course.

The first of the five parts into which this work has been divided is introductory in character and discusses the relationship of English to other languages. Just here the author has found it "necessary to an understanding of English as of any other Teutonic speech" to give place to an outline of one of the principal peculiarities of all Teutonic languages, namely, the shifting of consonants. This phenomenon was first examined by Rask, a Danish scholar, and was later arranged by the German scholar, Jacob Grimm, under the law now known as Grimm's Law. This law was further applied to other cases, seemingly inexplicable, by another Danish philologist, Karl Verner, whose name is now linked with that of Grimm. This consonantal shift is one of the features of English philology which never fail to awaken the interest of students, even though their study be limited to English.

The second part is entitled, "The Standard Language and the Dialects." Many will be



interested and some surprised, perhaps, because of the emphasis, not necessarily by the announcement, which the writer makes regarding the relation of the English to the Norman conquerors during the Middle English period.

"Mistaken conceptions as to the influence of the Norman conquest on the English language are largely due to erroneous ideas of the relations existing between the two peoples during the so-called Norman period. It has already been pointed out, that the affairs of England and Normandy were becoming mixed as early as the beginning of the eleventh century, when Emma of Normandy became the wife of Æthelred of England. When William the Norman came, it was to no ordinary subjugation of a hostile people."

... "Again, the actual number of the Normans coming in at the conquest has been greatly exaggerated in popular estimation." Our former conceptions regarding the breach in English life and institutions resulting from the conquest have already been corrected by later historians, but philologists have been slow to accept the evidence of the historians regarding the continuity of things English, partly because of lack of evidence, partly through a failure to keep pace with historical investigation. Dr. Emerson has called a timely halt here. It remains now for students of this period to give more weight to the evidence of such historians as Freeman and Stubbs. They must not confine themselves to literary documents. A recent critic of Chaucerian literature has made an error in the same direction. He speaks of the language of Chaucer as if the poet had invented every word and phrase, as if he had not employed the poetic vocabulary inherited from all his predecessors. Insufficient evidence is the charge against such a critic.

In the third section, after discussing the native and foreign elements in the English vocabulary, the author turns to two of the most important topics; namely, the history of English sounds, phonology, and the history of English inflection. More than one half of the book is devoted to these two divisions. Dr. Emerson has treated the phonology in the simplest manner, and wisely so. While fully appreciating that there is "no true etymologizing which does not base itself upon a

thorough understanding of sound-laws, and an accurate accounting for the changes in individual sounds," he has avoided the use of too complicated a system for the average college student, one might venture to write college teacher, for this branch of philology has been studiously shunned. Even recent historians of the English language have been afraid to enter this most arid, and therefore neglected, region of linguistic study. We say afraid, for we all confess our timidity, and know that Dr. Emerson has not over-estimated the value of phonology when he emphasizes the "importance of the spoken, that is the living, word as fundamental to all linguistic study." Such a chapter as this will do more to hasten that "inevitable day," when phonology will be recognized as a fundamental adjunct to the preparation for a historical course in English language, than other more elaborate systems designed for the same purpose. We have in mind the authoritative work of Mr. Sweet. The very elaborateness of the latter's work renders it useless to all students that have not had the double advantage of possessing phonetic skill and the author's personal instruction.

Teachers of English grammar who have never been philologically trained will find many of the most vexing problems of modern English grammar traced to their origin and briefly analyzed in the final section of the book. Here the historical usage of words and phrases is presented to explain the changes that they have undergone. Nor does the author oppose the historical form to the current form, he does not encourage antagonism to good form by making the historical appear more worthy of acceptance than the former. It is sometimes found that teachers encourage such expressions as, "It is me," because it is historical, after the genius of the language, they aver, and they thus oppose the work of the rhetorician. Undoubtedly the duty of the historian is solely to furnish us the data and to allow us to draw our own conclusions, but the historian is apt to know best what our conclusions should be, especially when the best language is the history of the best writers.

In addition to the skilfull arrangement of the subject-matter, the book is supplied with a



good map, chart and diagrams illustrating the location and movements of the dialects. The index also is complete.

CHARLES F. MCCLUMPHA.

Ripon College.

### MODERN LITERATURE.

*Studi di Letterature Straniere*, di B. ZUMBINI.

Firenze: Successori Le Monnier, 1893. 8vo, pp. vii, 264.

THIS book has received the highest praise, not only in Italy, but in the other countries whose literatures it discusses, and surely in learning, taste and charm of manner it ranks with the best criticism that our generation produces. The author has no rigid system. Works of literature are not classified like the stuffed animals and fossils of a museum, nor are they made to serve as premises for scientific generalizations; yet in his wide, almost universal reading, Zumbini has had a sharp eye for analogies and resemblances of every kind, but particularly for comparisons with the literature of his own Italy, so that his book is fruited with fresh ideas and suggestive views. Almost every essay contains hints for investigations which would be sure to yield interesting results.

Three of his subjects are taken from English literature, four from the German, and two from the French. The list is as follows: The Pilgrim's Progress, The Paradise Lost, Macbeth; The Messiah, the Goethe-Museum in Weimar, Goethe's Egmont and Manzoni's Conte di Carmagnola, Nathan der Weise; L'Abbaye de Thélème of Rabelais, and Hugo's L'Art d'être Grand Père. Worn as many of these topics are, they are here treated with such originality and such critical ability as to make every page interesting and instructive, for the author disdains to repeat universally known theories and will rather remain silent than merely echo the thoughts of others.

Zumbini's critical judgment is penetrating and sure. Macbeth's character is studied as a combination of action and imagination, of evil desire and avenging conscience; the *Messias* is ranked between the religious vision and the epic, Klopstock's inventions are more numerous than his creations; the continued

vitality of poetic ideals is illustrated by Hugo's poetry of infancy and childhood, which in turn is defined by a luminous comparison with Wordsworth. At every point neglected beauties are revealed, unsuspected relations made manifest.

The keynote of the volume is Italy. The episode of the *Abbaye de Thélème* is considered in connection with Ariosto's island of Alcina, with the new ideas of marriage, honor and religion, with Laurentius Valla, and, above all, with the spirit of the Renaissance. *Nathan der Weise* reveals its obligations to Cardano and to three of Boccaccio's tales. The *Pilgrim's Progress*, the *Paradise Lost* and the *Messias*, all suggest the *Divine Comedy*. The Goethe-Museum is filled with objects that make the Italian heart palpitate. Particularly significant among them are volumes of Manzoni and Foscolo in the library and many objects of art gathered during the *Italian Journey*, objects whose influence upon Goethe's development is set forth and traced back to the pictures in his father's house at Frankfort. A reverse obligation is considered in the essay on Goethe's *Egmont* and Manzoni's *Conte di Carmagnola*. Starting from a quotation from *Egmont* written on the fly leaf of the copy of his tragedy which Manzoni presented to Goethe, the author traces the resemblance between the two works in sentiment, in characters and in the lack of true dramatic quality.

Naturally, regarding the *Pilgrim's Progress* and the *Paradise Lost*, which are grouped together as "Two English poems of the Seventeenth Century," there could be little to say which would have absolute novelty; yet, in reading these studies, one finds the continual incitement of fresh interest. There are passages it is true, that are slightly disappointing. The typical in Puritanism is not sufficiently distinguished from what was individual; the study of Bunyan's mind is colorless after the imaginative psychology of Taine, and his materials are underrated; the remarks about the hisses with which the demons greet Satan appear a little strained. But the reviewer feels hesitation in speaking of such slight defects, in the presence of such extraordinary merits. Starting from the idea

that the Puritan faith was not hostile to art but was naturally poetical, excepting for the restriction it placed upon the creative faculty, Zumbini analyzes the ideas, the action and the characters in these works of Bunyan and Milton, and traces beauties and faults to their causes in the Puritan conception of life. The most masterly part is the analysis of the character of Satan, the fiend with tender and noble elements, the hero, the orator, the "Farinata sopranaturale." His qualities are educed from the writings of the Fathers, he is set in the midst of all the poetry of passion and tragedy, he is shown to have been essentially human even to the Puritans. A short quotation from this study will illustrate the author's manner and recommend his book more than many praises. Having called attention to the discrepancy between Satan in action and Satan as described by Milton, he writes:

"Why does he derive greater advantage from the first condition than from the second? The reason is that the Puritan idea was present to the poet less strongly in the one case than in the other. When describing, Milton thought of the effect of the work itself upon the hearts of men and wished that it should help to make them abhor in Satan the origin of all evil, severed from all possibility of good elements. But placing him in action he unconsciously sank his ideas in his creation and, besides making him more heroic, took from him of the supernatural what he added to him of the human."

LEWIS F. MOTT.

*The College of the City of New York.*

#### MEDIAEVAL LITERATURE.

*Studies in Mediaeval Life and Literature* by EDWARD TOMPKINS McLAUGHLIN. Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in Yale University. New York and London: 1894. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 8vo. xi+188 pp.

THE author follows out two purposes in these *Studies*; first to present to us pictures of the Middle Ages as they were, and then to trace the thread of human unity running through them. Primarily, though, these essays are a study of man, with his foibles and virtues, his sentiments and passions, his hopes and his fears. It is no defence, no glorification, no dazzling picture, and likewise no gloomy

sketch in sombre colors of those times of which, as the author rightly says:

"The usual conception seems to consist of a few facts and theories about the feudal system and the crusades, the names with possibly some traits of a few eminent public figures and a general impression of confusion and obscurity . . . sunshine and twilight on either hand and in the background an impenetrable mist concealing the great masses of humanity as well as all concrete actual lives of all the great."

No fair-minded reader will deny that Professor McLaughlin has accomplished his object and has produced a work of interest to the general reader as also to the special student. For the latter it has an additional scientific value, as it contains an untold amount of careful research and study, of thorough learning and clear, penetrating literary discrimination, though its pages are not loaded down with learned footnotes and have not been multiplied by appendices and fruitless discussions of obscure points. It is a great pity that the unfinished study on Dante, the embodiment and culminating point of mediaevalism, could not be included and that other projected ones on Wolfram von Eschenbach and Walther von der Vogelweide had never taken shape.

A short biographical sketch and an appreciative discussion of the author's career as scholar and teacher by Professor Lounsbury, introduce the *Studies* to us, of which the first treats of the Mediaeval Feeling for Nature. Schiller in his *Naïve und Sentimentalische Dichtung* had called attention to the difference between the ancient and modern feeling for nature and partially analyzed this difference. Humboldt in the *Kosmos* and Friedländer in *Die Sittengeschichte der Römer* had followed out his suggestions and traced in general outline the history of this sentiment. Others in a fragmentary way have touched upon the question, but no one before Professor McLaughlin has treated this period so fully, enriched our knowledge so much and by happy comparisons made us appreciate so clearly and concretely the sentiment of mediaeval man for nature in all its phases. He reaches these interesting definite conclusions:

"That the northern poets described storm, winter, the ocean and kindred subjects, with



considerable force and fullness. In the cultivated literatures to the south natural description was mainly confined to the agreeable forms of beauty. . . . The exterior world was not made a subject of close observation, nor was its poetic availability realized as a setting for action, or as an interpreter of emotion."

The author has given a partial explanation of the difference of sentiment between the poets of the North and South, but not a full one. The feeling for nature of both northern and southern peoples was really an "animal sensation." The northern nations loved the fierce and the rugged because it appealed to their love of fight; it was but another phase of their Berserker nature. The feeling was that exultant feeling of defiance resulting from the mere physical resistance to storm and hardship. Christianity and the inheritance of Roman civilization had toned down the fierce heathen spirit of the southern nations. The sagas and epics of the north breathe this old heathen spirit, the epics and lyrics of France and Germany show the refining influences of Christianity and Roman culture.

We cannot help wondering that the Middle Ages, which in their literature and their life show so often weariness of the world, of its vanities and unsatisfying pleasures, should not have developed the "sentimental" love of nature (characteristic to such a remarkable degree of their eulogists and imitators, the Romantic poets), which Schiller says "is like the longing of a sick man for health." It seems strange that it should have been left to the unbelieving rationalistic Eighteenth Century to call forth into luxuriant growth, the dormant germ of that sentiment which is "so closely akin to religion." Yet the reason is not far to seek. The mediaeval weary heart and soul sought refuge in the church and monastic seclusion, in pious devotion and religious service, while to the Eighteenth Century there was no other resource but to flee to nature for peace and rest which the world did not give. And it is interesting to note that the restless, yearning search for the mystic "blue flower," the symbol of the restful harmony of nature, led so many German Romanticists back into the fold of the Mediaeval Church and its rest-giving beliefs.

The sentiment for nature today is calmer,

deeper, truer and more universal, due possibly to the development of aesthetic taste in general, "to a blind following of the poets," and also to the fact that, as in Rousseau's and Schiller's age, the jaded human soul goes to nature for the restoration of health and peace. But it is chiefly due, as the essayist correctly concludes, "to the growth of modern refinement and ethical sensitiveness," which makes man appreciate more and more our new physical symbols of human emotion, and realize that nature "enfolds him with love and beauty, it cries back to his passion and pain in winter and storm, from the solemn mountains it reminds him of himself, an unconquerable partner of its own eternity."

At the very outset of his second essay on Ulrich von Liechtenstein the author disarms criticism when he says wittily, "if defective eyesight makes a man fancy a burdock a rose bush, and if he tends and cherishes the absurd idealization—at least, the man has a sentiment for roses." Yet it is but justice to say that he has given a too-sympathetic and favorable estimate of Ulrich, of whom he makes an old German "Don Quixote." As the hero led a double life of love, one of prosaic fondness for wife and home, and the other of extravagant devotion to his lady love and knight errantry, so it stands with his real life and his poetical life. History gives us the one picture of a heavily built, strong and brave soldier, an unscrupulous, violent partisan and a cunning, self-seeking politician. His *Frauendienst* gives us the very reverse. Even his ingenuous confessions bear testimony to his shrewdness, for some of the most affecting incidents have been borrowed or else highly colored by like incidents taken from other sources. Yet Ulrich does have a "sentiment for roses" and has unrolled a poetically true picture of the chivalrous *Minnedienst*, the controlling sentiment in the lives of the knightly class. The study is a mere narrative sketch, full of interesting digressions and smaller studies by the way, unpretentious, yet written in a charming, simple style and containing choice bits of poetical translation from the original. One of the chief charms of the book is the style, anything but showy and flashy, and yet rising in passages to great power and beauty. With all



its simplicity and directness the style is poetical, rich in sentiment and feeling, interesting, fervent and spirited throughout.

The interspersed translations of some real gems of mediaeval poetry are exquisite. English translations of the mediaeval German epic poetry, with their jingling metres, their many faults of rhetoric, style and translation, are anything but successful, generally destroying the chief beauty of the originals, namely their powerful simplicity. Few have attempted the lyrics for they have realized the difficulty of the task. Bayard Taylor's translations in his *Studies* are richer and more sensuous, less rigid in style and form, but he has allowed himself many liberties with the text of the originals. Professor McLaughlin's translations of unusually well-chosen passages are as graceful and delicate as Taylor's and are true translations, translations of word, of music, of thought and of spirit.

Apart from such translations and side lights thrown upon the "misty background of the Middle Ages," which make the essay on Neidhart von Reuenthal so readable, there is an additional interest in the fact that it is the only study in English of this Peasants' Poet and it is fully the peer of any discussion in German of this same subject. Professor McLaughlin was undoubtedly right in his estimate of Neidhart as a poet and of his rank in society and personal character. He was a court poet, living amongst the peasants to some extent, but using the materials gathered there chiefly for the diversion of his courtly audiences, who were delighted with his freshness and verve, but in his old age relapsing into conventionality, harping ever on the worn out themes of his earlier successful songs. It would seem, however, that the episode of Vriderune's mirror which is so oft a recurring theme, fraught with regret and sadness, in Neidhart's poems, and which Professor McLaughlin has so ingeniously explained, has a simpler and hence more probable explanation in the theory advanced by Keinz in the *Proceedings of the Munich Academy* (1888 Vol. ii, 309 ff.).

This study on Neidhart as well as the succeeding one, entitled Meier Helmbrecht, are interesting in themselves, but especially so to the student of manners and customs and of

social institutions. The following study on "Childhood" is of more general human interest. The limitations of a review prevent a detailed presentation of its many interesting facts and discussions. It is a pity that the author of the *Studies* was obliged in it to omit a proposed detailed comparison of Longfellow's *Golden Legend* and *Der arme Heinrich*. Nothing could bring out so clearly the difference between mediaeval and modern sentiment in many respects. Longfellow throughout consciously strives to get into the spirit of the period of his story, endeavors to strip off the six centuries of culture and advanced thought, though in vain. He feels the need of changing small details, of creating by extraneous pictures a background and an atmosphere for his legend in order to gain credence for it. Simple religious faith becomes mystic ecstasy; the maiden, who in Hartmann's story is earthy of this earth, flesh of our flesh, is transformed by the modern poet into an ethereal being of the Fra Angelico type, chiefly halo, golden harp and flowing cerulean robe. The miraculous cure, so natural a consequence of the premises of the mediaeval story, Longfellow feels constrained to explain rationally and so makes dull prose of one of its most poetical features. The *Golden Legend* is a charming poem, but its author did not possess the childlike faith characteristic of mediaevalism, and necessary to sustaining the poetic illusion of the simple story of the peasant girl and the prince. *Der arme Heinrich* is all that Professor McLaughlin claims for it, and it is painful and humiliating to read such childish criticisms of it as are to be found in Gostwick and Harrison's *History of German Literature*.

In these essays the author has run through almost the entire scale of human sentiment and feeling, in order in his last to strike the full deep note of man's noblest passion to which the hearts of all vibrate responsively. The story of Abelard and Heloise is not a new one, though the version here, drawn from the first sources, is probably new to most people. It is a brilliant piece of writing, in the best sense of that abused word, "brilliant." Analysis will not help to an appreciation; it ought simply to be read and enjoyed.

A word in regard to the exterior of the

*Studies* which have been put in an attractive, tasty binding, and neatly printed. The printing is unusually accurate, only one misprint having come to the reviewer's notice.

As we lay aside the book we are ready to echo the opinion of a critic who concluded his criticism of this work as follows:

"Not only do those who knew the author have cause for profoundly regretting the sudden ending of a literary career which opened with such unusual promise, but everybody, friend or stranger, must mourn the loss of one whose past work gave hope of such abundant fruition in the future."

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Yale University.

### SOME RECENT INVESTIGATIONS ON MODALITY.

*Perfective and Imperfective Aktionsart im Germanischen*, von WILHELM STREITBERG. PBB. xv, 70 ff.

*Zur Frage über den Ursprung der perfectivierenden Function der Verbalpräfixe*. Nebst Einleitung über das Zusammenwirken des syntaktischen und phonetischen Factors. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Magisterwürde, von CARL RECHA. Dorpat: 1893.

*Verba Perfectiva namentlich im Heliand*. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der germanischen Verbalcomposition, von RUDOLF WUSTMANN. Leipzig: 1894.

'MODALITY' (German 'Aktionsart') is the character or mode of action expressed by a verb, and is usually divided into two kinds, perfective, and imperfective.

"Perfective [a word coined with especial reference to peculiarities of the Slavic languages] we designate verbs the meaning of which implies the attaining of an end, referring either to the moment of the attainment (momentary perfectivity), or to the striving after an end up to the moment when it is reached (durative perfectivity)"

(cf. Wustmann, p. 1), imperfective those which do not imply the attaining of an end. Modality has nothing whatever to do with the relative time of action (Zeitstufe), which is expressed by tense. For example, in the sentences "*Ich erstieg den Berg*—I arrived at

the top of the mountain," and "*Die Kurse stiegen*—the stocks were rising," the action referred to takes place in the past, while the verb in the first case is perfective, in the second imperfective, and the modality of the verbs is not altered by changing the tense-form from preterite to present, perfect, or future. The difference of modality and relative time of action (first sharply defined by Tobler, KZ. xiv, 108-139) is very important and must be kept clearly in mind.

In the Slavo-Lettic dialects the different kinds of modality are so sharply defined that the underlying principle has been claimed as peculiar to that language-group. The existence of traces of such a distinction in the Germanic languages was first pointed out by Jakob Grimm (1824, Preface to his translation of Wuk Stephanowitsch's *Servian Grammar*). Later investigations (Bernhardt, Dorfeld, Pietsch) were almost exclusively confined to the prefix *ge-* and as a result of this isolation of *ge-* from the other verbal prefixes, its chief function, that of producing perfectivity, was overlooked. The first scholar to prove conclusively what Grimm had merely suggested, was Wilhelm Streitberg in his article on "Perfective and imperfective Aktionsart im Germanischen" (PBB. xv, 70 ff.).

In Slavic we find the following categories of verbs, according to their modality (cf. Streitberg 1, pp. 70-72):

1. Imperfective, or continuative verbs; *lěsti*, 'steigen,' 'be mounting';

2. Perfective, or resultative verbs; *vuzlěsti*, 'ersteigen,' 'ascend,' 'surmount,' 'arrive at the top of.' This class may be subdivided into:

a. momentary perfectives: *ersteigen*, 'arrive at the top of,'—Sl. *ubiti*, 'erschlagen,' 'slay';

b. durative perfectives: *besteigen*, 'ascend,'—Sl. *preberem*, 'ich lese durch,' 'I am reading through';

3. iterative verbs, both perfective and imperfective; not existing in the Germanic languages.

Graphically represented, 1 would be an infinite straight line; 2 a, a point; 2 b, a limited straight line; 3, a series of infinite straight lines, points, or limited straight lines respectively.



Streitberg's article, dealing with Gothic exclusively, divides Gothic verbs into :

1. Imperfective simple (that is, uncompound-ed) verbs; for example, *saihwān*, 'see,' 'have the faculty of seeing,' 'look at'; *hausjan*, 'hear,' 'have the faculty of hearing'; *taujan*, 'be engaged upon doing';

2. Perfective simple verbs in which the perfective idea is inherent; *qiman*, 'come'; *wairpan*, 'become'; *briggan*; *finpan*;

3. Perfective compounds, formed by prefixing prepositional adverbs to imperfective verbs; for example, *gasaihwān*, 'perceive by seeing'; *gahausjan*, 'perceive by hearing'; *Saei habai ausona hansjandona*, *gahausjai* 'let him who has hearing ears perceive'; *fair-*, *undgreipan*, 'seize'; *usgaggan*, 'go out'; *gataujan*, 'complete.' These Streitberg divides into :

a. Such compounds as receive by the prefix an increment in meaning; *insaihwān* 'to look at,' 'look into';

b. Absolute perfectives, in which the content of the verb is changed only in modality; *gasaihwān*, 'perceive.' *Ga-*, which appears in only a few cases with its original local force (=Latin *co-*), becomes, on account of this lack of local force, the perfective particle  $\kappa\alpha\tau'$   $\epsilon\lambda\omicron\chi\eta\nu$ . The perfective simple verbs do not enter into composition with colorless *ga-*, except when thereby a durative perfective is changed into a momentary perfective; a fact which escaped Streitberg's notice. So *swiltan*, 'die,' certainly contains a perfective idea,—we cannot think of dying without having the end in mind,—*gaswiltan* is a momentary perfective, 'breathe one's last.'

Finally (4), there are a limited number of imperfective *simplicia* that, by their nature, do not admit of perfectivity; such as *wisan*, 'be' (corresponding perfective: *wairpan* 'become'); *rodjan*, 'speak,' 'talk' (perfective: *qipan*, 'say'); *liban*, 'live'; *frijon*, 'love'; *fijan*, 'hate.' They remain imperfective in composition (*atwisan*, 'be present'; *miprodjan*, 'talk together,') and are never compounded with colorless *ga-*.

Streitberg further shows how perfectivity is used by Ulfilas to make good losses that Gothic had suffered in tense-forms as compared with the I.-E. parent-speech; as, for example, by the rendering of the Greek aorist

by a perfective.

Already in Gothic there is a tendency to use *ga-* as the mere formal sign of the past participle, a very natural development. This process has been going on steadily, until in Mod. H.G. *ge-* is established as formal sign of the past participle. The original state of affairs is to be seen only in verbs compounded with inseparable prefixes, further in *worđen* in the perfect of the passive voice (*er ist getötet worden*), and in occasional remnants in dialectic forms (*worđen, kommen, funden; Götz von Berlichingen: troffen*).

Recha's monograph adds nothing new to the subject of verb-modality, and is decidedly inferior to Streitberg's masterly investigation. Streitberg, as Recha informs us, was not justified in transferring Slavo-Lettic verb-categories into the Germanic field; but this objection is ill-founded, since Streitberg uses the Slavic only to give a clear idea of modality on account of the sharply defined distinction of its different categories in these languages, that is, for comparison and illustration. Recha attempts to trace the development of perfectivity back to original conditions. The lengthy introduction, a discussion of the co-operation of the syntactic and phonetic factors in language, largely made up of quotations, has a very indirect bearing on the question. After attesting by liberal quotations from Brugmann and Delbrück the original use of reduplication as a means of expressing perfectivity, Recha advances the theory that the later production of perfectivity by a verbal prefix is merely a formal transferring of function from the reduplicating syllable to prefix (p. 69), because (p. 73):

"the Sprachgefühl for reduplication having been weakened was finally satisfied with any prefix, which lengthened the form of the verb in the same way as the reduplicating syllable."

This—the only point Recha makes—is certainly false. Perfectivity as such is not developed, but is inherent in the combination of the contents of a verb and a local adverb (cf. Wustmann cited below).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Other mistakes of Recha are, 1 his classing all uncompound verbs as imperfectives, thus ignoring the second class in Streitberg's division (*qiman, wairpan*, etc.); 2 his statement, on p. 46, that Gothic uses the preterite of com



While Recha's investigation on modality is a step backward and would best have remained unprinted, Wustmann's *Verba Perfectiva* is a welcome and valuable contribution to the subject. It supplements, and in several points represents an advance upon Streitberg. The most important of these are the following:

"The change of modality by a prefix is nothing but the result of the combination of the contents of both verb and prefix (p. 18). The latter fixes upon a certain point in the activity of the verb, which as such may be compared to an infinite straight line; perfectivity, or perfective modality consists in representing the activity as starting from this point, or striving towards it, or just reaching it. Therefore the word 'perfectivity' is insufficient, since it fails to recognize the equal claim of the ingressive to recognition with the perfective or effective. In *blindai ussaihwand, daubai gahausjand* 'the blind obtain sight, and the deaf regain their hearing,' both verbs are distinctly ingressive. In a number of verbs it is possible to conceive of the original final point of activity as the beginning or starting point of the same activity later. *Ersehen* originally meant 'perceive'; but as the activity of seeing is continued, *ersehen* may also be taken for an ingressive. The same must have been the case in a number of verbs like Gothic *gasaihwan*, and so we have besides the M.H.G. perfectives *gestin, gesitzen geligen*, the ingressives 'enter into the state of standing, sitting, lying,' that is, 'stop,' 'sit down,' 'lie down.' The separation of perfectives and ingressives, neglected by Streitberg, is essential, and justified by historic development."

"Since all relations in language which appear to us figuratively were originally only space conceptions, and since the perfectivity, or more correctly momentariness of a verb, always refers to a point in space, or a moment in time, one must start from the fundamental meaning of the prefix in explaining perfective compounds [which, again, Streitberg failed to do]. Streitberg's distinction of 'absolute' perfectivity (colorless *ga-*) and perfectivity with simultaneous increment in meaning (see above), is unessential; there really is no absolute perfectivity as long as the reaching of an end is felt in a verbal idea, and a really colorless

pound (perfective) verbs as perfect tense (*tauja* 'I am doing,' *tauwida* 'I did,' *gatawida* 'I have done,') contradicted by himself on p. 96; 3 his failing to perceive that most prefixes, besides imparting perfectivity, give the verb a distinctly local idea, an increment in meaning (cf. p. 89 b.); and his assertion that these prefixes are used indiscriminately and interchangeably (p. 94.)—The work contains some confusing misprints, as for example, p. 93 l. 7 from below *unbetonten* for *betonten*; on p. 65, ll. 10 and 13 from below, *Schmalz* instead of *Stolz*.

prefix soon becomes a mere formal sign, as in M.H.G. *ich enmac gesin*."

The third class of verbal concepts (besides perfective *simplicia* and compounds) mentioned by Wustmann (p. 4), such as *in die Kirche gehen*, I do not regard as a class by itself; the local adverb which expresses the reaching of an end, or motion towards it with the reaching implied, and the content of which has to be combined with the content of the verb to produce perfectivity, may be an adverb proper, an adverbial phrase, or an adverbial prefix.

"To be consistent," Wustmann continues, (p. 4) "we must extend the term 'perfective' to every transitive verb in which a stopping or interruption of the activity negatives at once the whole conception of the action. Thus *ich baue ein Haus* 'I am building a house' is perfective; without the idea of completion we should say *ich baue an einem Haus* 'I am building at or on a house.'<sup>2</sup> This explains at once why perfective compounds very often take their object in the accusative while the corresponding simplex does not; the accusative denoting complete subjection or subjugation of the object. For example, *nach der Krone greifen*, but *die Krone ergreifen*; *nach dem Geliebten blicken* but *den Geliebten erblicken*. The idea of completed action causes the verbs to be made transitive."

Another good example in addition to those cited from Wustmann is the verb *nachahmen*, which takes its object in the accusative when the imitation is perfect in all details, in the dative when such is not the case.

Wustmann's just but rather acrimonious criticism of Wunderlich's treatment of perfectivity and transitivity in his *Der deutsche Satzbau* (p. 24 ff.) contains an element of humor when one recalls to mind the harsh treatment which the elder Wustmann's *Sprachdummheiten* received at Wunderlich's hands.

Wustmann's special field for the investigation of modality is the Heliand. His task is more difficult than Streitberg's, because in the case of the Heliand we do not have a Greek original, translated by a highly educated man with a keen sense for idiom and beauty of language (—Does not Wustmann, as well as Streitberg, overrate this point? Ulfilas did not use perfectivity differently from the Goths

<sup>2</sup> Compare also *er zählt* 'he is counting,' imperfective, and *er zählt acht*, 'he counts eight,' perfective.

around him!); also the rhythm may have compelled the poet to sacrifice the prefix, as especially *gi-* (*ge-*) is a light syllable, and we cannot tell how far the feeling for its function as creating perfectivity had become weakened in Old Saxon; and finally we might be tempted to attribute to the numerous variations of a verbal idea one and the same kind of modality. We must give Wustmann the credit of having overcome these difficulties throughout his work, except in a few details.

The history of the development of the different prefixes (chapter 1) is an admirably clear presentation of the subject and a valuable feature of the whole treatise. These prefixes appear in O.S. as: *gi* (*ge*); *a* (Gothic *us*, Mod. H.G. *er*), *for*, *far*, *af*, *ant*, *an*, *bi*, *be*, *umbi*, *of*, *ti* (*te*), *thurh*, *undar*, *unidar*. It is especially interesting to follow what Wustmann says on *gi-*, the different meanings of which—sociative, intensive, perfective, and ingressive—he develops from original ‘together’ = Latin *co-*, which has undergone the same changes in meaning. The modern German intransitive *gefrieren* (properly ‘zusammenfrieren,’ ‘fest frieren,’ then ‘ganz frieren,’ also ‘in den Zustand des Frierens eintreten’) illustrates this development; and modern German *zusammen* in such words as *zusammenbrechen*, *zusammenfallen*, exhibits a striking parallel.

Among the examples of perfective modality quoted in the next chapter, we should have expected Wustmann to give some cases of his third class, that is, the combination of imperfective verbs with adverbial phrases expressing the attaining of an end. Some of those quoted by him as imperfectives, are perfectives according to his own definition; so 232, “*legda im ena boc an barm*”;—1406/7, “*ac he it hoho scal an seli settean*.”

Other cases are: 101/3 “*Thea liudi stodun umbi that helaga hus, endi geng im the giherodo man an thana uuih innan*”;—122, “*nu hiet he me an thesan sid faran*” (ingressive);—2180/2, “*tho sahn sie thar en hreo dragan, enan lifosan lichamon thea liudi forien, beran an enaru baru ut at thera burges dore*”;—3740, “*dref sie ut thanen*”;—3878/9, “*endi im ut thanan gengun*”;—4628/9, “*Giuet imu tho ut thanan inuudeas gern ludas gangan*”;—5971/2, “*ledda sie nt thanan antat he sie brahte an*

Bethania.”

*Fulgangan*, which is imperfective (‘oboedire,’) for example, 111/2, 446/9, appears as a durative perfective in 4551/2: “*thar sie the landuise lestian scoldun, fulgangan godes gibode*.” In 1096/7, “*thar ina se balouuiso let al obarsehan irminthiode*,” *obarsehan* is perfective, either durative or momentary, *obar* having also the force of *umbi*, ‘überschauen,’ ‘look over,’ ‘survey,’ or ‘einen Blick werfen auf,’ ‘cast a glance upon.’ These examples may possibly be taken as early cases of implicit or unexpressed perfectivity, which is so general in Mod. H. G. and especially in English and here due in large part to the weakening of the prefixes and the consequent lack of formal devices for indicating perfectivity.

In the *gi-* of *giniman* and *giqueðan* as distinct from the simple verbs, Wustmann sees intensive meaning. But it is more probable that, just as in *gaswillan* mentioned above, the prefix here changes a durative perfective into a momentary perfective. This function of *gi-*, which both Streitberg and Wustmann overlook, is important and should have been suggested to Wustmann by the sentence cited from *Götz von Berlichingen* (p. 4) ‘*Ich sterbe, sterbe, und kann nicht ersterben*’” where *er-* has the same force.

In the last chapter, dealing with syntactic relations of perfectivity, Wustmann opposes Streitberg’s view that perfective verbs serve to indicate the future; this tense is not distinct from the present, or it is indicated by the adverb *than*, or expressed by auxiliaries, for example *willean*, *sculan*, *mungan*, *thurban*, sometimes accompanied by the adverb *than*.<sup>3</sup>

EDWIN C. ROEDDER.

University of Michigan.

<sup>3</sup> It may be added in conclusion that an investigation of one or more of the Modern German classics with reference to the production of perfectivity by syntactical composition would certainly throw new light on the subject, and in this case the modern Sprachgefühl would be more reliable than *i*, is for the older stages of the language. Also Modern English would afford an interesting field for investigation in its periphrastic conjugation (‘He is bringing me the book,’ ‘was bringing me the book,’ ‘brought the book’: ‘he is going,’ but, ‘he loves,’ ‘he hates’).—Modern French has an excellent means for expressing perfectivity in its *Passé défini*, which is used for ingressives, momentary perfectives, and even durative perfectives when actions or conditions denoting an advance in the narration are included in one historical



## CORRESPONDENCE.

## DEOR'S COMPLAINT.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In 36 f. of the *Deor's Complaint* (Grein-Wülker, i, 280) the poet speaks of himself as *Heodeninga Scop* and of his being displaced by *Heorrenda*, a *leoðcræftig monn*. The resemblance of the names *Heodeninga* and *Heorrenda* to the *Heðinn* and *Hiarrandi* of the *Hildesaga* has suggested to various critics the possibility of establishing a connection between this part of the *Deor* and the story of *Hilde*. The difficulty consists, however, in reconciling the various relations of the characters of the poem with those of the saga. *Hiarrandi* in the saga is the father of *Heðinn*, in the *Deor* he is the minstrel of *Heoden*. Further, excepting the similarity in the names of these two characters, there is no connection whatever between the story of *Deor* and that of *Hilde*. Even as regards the names themselves there is no absolute necessity of associating them with the *Hildesaga*, for *Heoðen-Heðinn* is found elsewhere; e. g., in the story of *Helgi* and *Swava*, as the half-brother of *Helgi* (*Corp. Poet. Bor.* i, 144); cf. *Foerstmann, Altdeut. Namenbuch*, 652. *Heorrenda* is the same as the O.N. *Hiarrandi*, and from the fact that the M.H.G. form is *Hōrant* not *Herrant*, it is probable that there was a famous singer by the name of *Horant* with whom the O.N. *Hiarrandi* of the *Hildesaga* was confused, thus giving the A.S. *Heorrenda*. *Horant* of the *Kudrun* plays an entirely different rôle from the *Hiarrandi* of the *Snorra Edda*. He is here a famous singer who wins *Hilde* for his lord by his wonderful music. In this respect he is the same as the A.S. *Heorrenda*, but with this distinction: in the M.H.G. poem he is the nearest relative of *Hetel*, the wooer of *Hilde*, while in the *Deor* he is, as the poet was, the recipient of royal favour from his lord, with whom his relations are apparently purely official (for example "La république romaine dura presque 500 ans")—A striking parallel to the production of perfectivity by composition with verbal prefixes in the Germanic languages is afforded by the Latin, for example, *facio*—*conficio*—Gothic *tauja gatauja*, *sequor*—*consequor*—'I follow,—I reach, *amo*—*adamo*—'I love—I fall in love'; also with transitivity the compounds of *ire* 'go,' for example, *inire foedus*, *obire mortem*, *subire poenam*.

cial. In fact he is probably a foreigner whose skill in music has brought him to the notice of *Heoden* (cf. Meyer, *Beiträge* xvi, 523). The contrast is surely too great to justify us in supposing that the person who supplanted *Deor* is the same as the father of *Heðinn* in the one case, or the famous singer and close relative of *Hetel* in the other. As Meyer remarks, the similarity of the name *Horant* to that of an old famous singer has excited the minstrel's fancy, and he has ascribed to the warrior the gifts of the minstrel and thus made effective the winning of *Hilde*. The existence of such a singer seems probable from the episodic nature of the song of *Horant* (cf. Meyer, above), from the presence in the north of a *Hjarrandahljoð* (*F.A.S.*, iii, 223), and from the incident in the *Deor*. The name of the singer was probably not the same as that of the father of *Heðinn* in the *Sn. E.*, since if it were, the *Kudrun* would most likely preserve it in the form *Herrant*, but was similar, and could thus become easily confused with it, as we find it is in the *Deor*.

The story for the A.S., which is related to the *Hildesaga*, is merely this, that there was an original tale of a famous singer with a name similar to *Hiarrandi* of the *Sn. E.*, which was later supplanted by it. The name of the people, the *Heodeningas*, being merely a patronymic, is quite independent of any connection with the *Hildesaga*.

A further confusion with a character of this saga seems to have occurred in 14 of the *Deor*, where Grein, followed by Wülker, reads *maeð Hilde*, 'the violation of *Hilde*.' This passage has been much disputed, and Grein's note under *maeð* in his *Sprachschatz*, where he suggests that *Odila* is meant, would be accepted at once but for the difficulty in accounting for the name *Hilde* instead of *Odila*. From the presence of such a confusion in 36 f. with other names of the *Hildesaga*, we are surely justified in explaining the use of *Hilde* here, the most famous name of the saga, as a similar confusion for the less known *Odila*. The use of the name in compounds, such as *Beadohild*, *Hildeburh*, etc., shows an acquaintance with it in A.S. The use of the names of characters in the latter part of the poem, which resemble, but have not the same story as those



of the *Hildesaga*, may explain here the similar absence of the story with the use of the name of Hilde. With this identification of the names of Hilde and Odila, the passage will be clear, for the incidents narrated give a consistent account of the story of Odila and her violation by Eomanric.

JAS. W. TUPPER.

Johns Hopkins University.

### VERSE AS PROSE IN THE 'AYEN-BITE.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Morris pointed out on p. 5 of his edition of the *Ayenbite*, a passage of eight lines in verse, written in the MS. as prose. The fact seems to have escaped his attention that the prayers with which the MS. opens and closes are in *rime coulée*:—

*Aye pe uondi [n]gges of pe dyeule: zay pis  
pet uolgez.*

*"Zuete iesu pin holy blod/  
pet pou ssedest aue pe rod/  
uor me and uor maukende:  
Ich bidde pe hit by me sseld/  
auoreye pe wycked uend:  
al to mi lynes ende.*

*zuo by hit."* (p. 1)

The other occurs at the end of the disquisition on the difference between men and beasts.

*Mayde/ and moder mylde.  
uor loue of pine childe:  
pet is god an man;  
Me pet am zuo wylde/  
uram zeune pou me ssylde:  
ase ich pe bydde cau.'*

*amen.* (p. 271)

The use of assonance in the first passage is paralleled on the same page in the verse written as such.

C. G. CHILD.

Johns Hopkins University.

### A PROTEST.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—I desire to protest against the manner in which my book, *How to Think in French*, is reviewed in your January number. Reviews are presumably intended for the in-

formation of your readers, that they may decide whether the books reviewed merit further examination. No such information is conveyed in the present case. The reviewer either fails to discover the features which characterize my book and in which it differs from other books, or else he purposely ignores them. In fact, any one could have written the remarks of the reviewer if he had not read the book at all, but merely glanced at page 3 and a small part of the appendix.

But this is not the worst. The writer takes it upon himself to impute mercenary motives to me, because I inform those who need assistance in pronunciation that I have published a book in which their difficulties are explained. Furthermore, he makes two remarks which betray a lack of conscientiousness: First that I "would appear too zealous and demonstrative in praising the excellence of my work or works;" and, secondly, "don't promise too much." There is not a single sentence in the book that can be quoted in support of these remarks.

CHAS. F. KROEH.

Stevens Institute of Technology.

### FRENCH LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—*Quatre-vingt-treize*\* is one of Hugo's masterpieces in prose. It is a leaflet, fanciful for the most part, in the history of that great struggle for human rights, to which, in spite of its follies, its excesses, its horrors, we return with never-ceasing interest. The young man or woman who does not become fascinated with its seductive terrors, whether from the standpoint of history or fiction, is intellectually utterly hopeless and falls into the category of those individuals "who have no music in their souls."

Hugo's book is, of course, too long and unwieldy as a whole to be used for class-purposes, and Prof. Boïelle has done an excellent work in adapting it. It occupies in its present shape one hundred and eighty-six small octavo pages and, if read rapidly, can be easily gone over by a second year class in a few weeks. To judge from the impression made by a hurried perusal, for I have not compared the adaptation with the original, the work has been excellently done and will prove a welcome addition to our reading texts. The notes contain all that is needful for explaining the textual difficulties. It would have been well if the proof reader had not allowed so many imperfect letters to escape correction.

SAMUEL GARNER.

U. S. Naval Academy.

\**Quatre-vingt-Treize*. By Victor Hugo. Adapted for use in Schools by JAMES BOÏELLE, A. B., Senior French Master in Dulwich College.

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1895.

## A PARALLEL TO GOETHE'S EUPHORION.

IN the first part of Tieck's *Phantastus* (1812), one of the company which makes up both the audience and the narrators of the tales contained in this collection, recites a poem, also entitled 'Phantastus,' introducing a vision of the principal characters of romantic poetry, such as Terror, Folly, Nature, Love, etc. In this vision there occurs the following description of the 'Scherz,' the fondled child of romantic imagination:

Da'sah ich einen Kleinen gaukeln  
Und sich in allen Blumen schaukeln,  
Ein herzigs Kind, das auf und nieder  
Im Tanze schwang die zarten Glieder.  
Bald klettert' es in Epheuranken  
Und liess sich kühn vom Winde schwanken,  
Bald stand oben am Fels der Lose,  
Und duckte sich in eine Rose,  
So eilig dass der Stengel knickte  
Wie er sich in die Röhre bückte.  
Dann fiel er lachend auf die Au  
Und war benetzt vom Rosenthau.  
In Blättern, aus Jasmin gezogen,  
Beschiff't er dann des Baches Wogen,  
Und bracht' als Kriegsgefangne heim  
Die Bienen mit dem Honigseim.

Auf einmal liess er alles liegen  
Und schien durch Lüfte schnell zu fliegen,  
Nun auf dem höchsten Tannenbaum  
Stand er und übersah den Raum.  
Mit Riesenstärke bog er dann  
Des Baumes Wipfel auf den Plan  
Und liess ihn dann zurücke schiessen.  
Des Baches Wogen mussten fliessen  
In Wasserfällen laut und brausend,  
Der mächt'ge Wald dazwischen sausend,  
Ein furchtbar Echo, das von oben  
Hin durch den Thalgrund sprach mit Toben,  
Dazu des Donners Krachen viel,  
Schien alles ihm nur Harfenspiel.  
Er selbst, der erst ein kleiner Zwerg,  
War jetzt grossmächtig wie ein Berg,  
Und sprang so schnell wie Blitzes Lauf  
Zur Höhe des Gebirgs hinauf,

Riss aus der Wurzel mächt'ge Felsen,  
Die liess er sich zum Thale wälzen  
Mit lautem Donnern, furchtbarm Krachen,  
Das machte ihn von Herzen lachen — etc.

Tieck *Schriften*, iv, p. 139, f.

It is hard not to see here if not the prototype at least the suggestion for Goethe's 'Euphorion.' Nearly all the essential features of the latter figure are found in this conception of Tieck's: the roving disposition, the reckless striving, the sudden development from childhood to manhood, the superhuman inspiration and power. Only the tragic element is missing.

Even in details there are striking analogies. The 'Scherz' dances about between flowers and swings to and fro on slender boughs; Euphorion says:

5099. Nun lasst mich hüpfen  
Nun lasst mich springen!  
Zu allen Lüften  
Hinaufzudringen  
Ist mir Begierde;  
Sie fasst mich schon.

The 'Scherz' chases a swarm of bees; Euphorion makes frolic with the chorus:

5155. Ihr seid so viele  
Leichtfüssige Rehe.  
Zu neuem Spiele  
Frisch aus der Nähe!  
Ich bin der Jäger,  
Ihr seid das Wild.

The 'Scherz' delights in the uproar of nature; Euphorion delights in the thunder of battle.

5271. Und hört ihr donnern auf dem Meere,  
Dort wiederdonnern Thal um Thal?

The 'Scherz' appears colossal even on the mountain top; of Euphorion the chorus says:

5239. Seht hinauf, wie hoch gestiegen!  
Und erscheint uns doch nicht klein.

Is all this mere coincidence? Is it not reasonable to assume that one of the most characteristic productions of the foremost romantic writer should have been in Goethe's mind when he undertook the poetic delineation of

the flighty offspring of Romanticism and Classicism? That the *Phantasm* was known to Goethe, need, of course, not be demonstrated. His high opinion of Tieck is well known.

KUNO FRANCKE.

Harvard University.

Only, — ADVERSATIVE. — MISPLACEMENT OF ADVERB.

I.

"THERE is [in Boston] a sort of park, the 'Common,' with iron railings, and houses something like the Piccadilly row above the Green Park, only all residences without shops. . . . It is really very tolerably English in the town [Boston]. The harbour is very pretty. It is like a very good sort of English country town in some respects."—Arthur Hugh Clough, Letter, Boston, November 15, 1852.—*Poems and Prose Remains*, vol. i., p. 184.

Only, as used above, seems identical in sense with *but*; commonly, however, the adversative *only* means *but* plus something more. The adversative *only* is an outgrowth of the sense *solely* that often belongs to the adverb *only*. Expression of its meaning by supplying the words understood would take different forms according to circumstances; as, *this being understood solely* (with or without *that*);—*this being reserved, excepted, changed, asked, begged, etc., solely* (with or without *that*).—*Do what you like, only don't miss the train.*

A few illustrations of the adversative *only* are given below; the substitution of *but* in any of these passages would cause some loss or distortion of the sense.

"My father was a yeoman, and had no lands of his own, only he had a farm of three or four pound a year at the uttermost, . . ."—Hugh Latimer, First Sermon before Edward VI., *Typical Selections from the Best English Writers* (Clarendon Press Series), vol. i., p. 3.

"But since you command, I obey: only let me say thus much, . . ."—Sir Philip Sidney, *Arcadia* (ed. 1598), p. 304.

"I am in all affected as your selfe,  
Glad that you thus continue your resolve,  
To sucke the sweets of sweete Philosophie.  
Only (good master) while we do admire  
This vertue and this morall discipline,  
Let's be no Stoickes, nor no stocks I pray."—*The Taming of the Shrew*, Act. I., sc. i.

" . . . but when I came back, I found no sign of any visitor, only there sat a creature like a wild cat upon one of the chests. . . ."—Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*, (Stockdale ed., 1790) vol. i., p. 67.

"The field began to be now clear, both armies stood, as it were, gazing at one another, only the king, having rallied his foot, seemed inclined to renew the charge. . . ."—Defoe, *Memoirs of a Cavalier* (Oxford, 1840), p. 170.

"Such artifices, indeed, were not unknown in the old Provençal poetry. . . . Only, in Rossetti at least, they are redeemed by a serious purpose. . . ."—Walter Pater, *Appreciations* (London, 1889), pp. 233-4.

"Sirs, they know I speak the truth! Sirs, believe me there's a way!  
Only let me lead the line. . . ."

Browning, *Hervé Riel*, vi.

"I propped her head up as before,

Only, this time my shoulder bore

Her head, which droops upon it still."—

*Id.*, *Porphyria's Lover*.

"[Daniel] Webster's father had a neighbour, who was an honest, well-behaved man, only given to drink."—Arthur Hugh Clough, Letter, January 3, 1853.

" . . . and, only she did not dare to own it to herself, was a great deal happier than she had been for many a day."—Thackeray, *The Ravenswing*, ch. vi.

" . . . for was it not an island, only with a better climate?"—Beaconsfield, *Lothair*, ch. lxx.

" . . . a legitimate enhancement of the worth of classical study; only one that is liable to be exaggerated, and perverted to the service of narrow-mindedness and pedantry."—William Dwight Whitney, *Oriental and Linguistic Studies* (New York, 1873), p. 407.

"We may believe him [De Quincey]; only he disliked, in others, that which was the express image of one of his own most marked peculiarities."—Fitzedward Hall, *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology* (New York, 1872), p. 9., foot-note.

"Petrarch, too, was a Florentine by origin, only not born there because of one of the accidents of her turbulent history."—Mrs. Oliphant, *The Makers of Venice* (London, 1888), Part II., ch. ii., p. 176.

"But it must nevertheless not be supposed that his [Girtin's] finest drawings . . . were completed without thought or labour, only that he began them with a clear conception to which he adhered."—Cosmo Monkhouse, *The Earlier English Water-Colour Painters* (London, 1890), p. 45.

"In the end it will prevail; only we must have patience."—Matthew Arnold, *Mixed Essays* (New York, 1883), "Falkland."



"Only beware of the fever, my friends, beware of the fever!"

For it is not like that of our cold Acadian climate, Cured by wearing a spider hung round one's neck in a nutshell."

—Longfellow's *Evangeline*, ll. 994-6.—See also ll. 1269 and 1297.

The censure of the use of *only* as an adverbative is passed here with the mention of it.

## II.

The commonest meanings of the adverb *only* are (approximately) "solely" and "merely." Critics often note instances of what they assume to be a misplacement of the adverb *only* in sentence making. Instances of an assumed misplacement of *only*, cited by Dr. Fitzedward Hall, are given below; the italics are Dr. Hall's.

"The infinitive of the verb is now only used substantively, as a nominative."—Cited in Dr. Hall's *Doctor Indoctus* (London, 1880) at page 19. The sentence is quoted from Professor John Nichol's *English Composition*. Dr. Hall, commenting on it, says: "Vague, with a misplacement of 'only.'"

"The possessive form *only* attaches to the last term of a title."—Cited in *Doctor Indoctus*, at page 32, from the same book.

"This fraud *could only be counteracted* by an edition equally cheap and more commodious."—Cited in Dr. Hall's *Modern English* (New York, 1873), at page 200 (foot-note), from Dr. Johnson's *Life of Pope*. In the index to *Modern English* there is the reference, "Only, misplacement of, 200."

"When next you see the bird which now perches above your head, you will *only* have five days more to live."—Cited in Dr. Hall's *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology* (New York, 1872), at page 21 (foot-note), from De Quincey's writings. The quotations from De Quincey among which this one appears are introduced by Dr. Hall, with the following prefatory words: "Page upon page might be filled with specimens of Mr. De Quincey's bad or dubious English. A few samples are subjoined."

"But, though we were ten days in Naples, I *only saw* one quarrel," etc.—Cited in *Recent Exemplifications of False Philology* from Mr. W. D. Howells's *Italian Journeys*. In the index to *Recent Exemplifications* one finds, "Only, misplacement of, 21, 107." At page

21, in a foot-note, is the quotation from De Quincey produced above; in a foot-note at page 107 is the quotation from Mr. Howells just cited.

Eight instances of an assumed misplacement of *only* in Professor Nichol's *English Composition* are noted by Dr. Hall in *Doctor Indoctus*.

If the usage of English literature has determined what is the right place for *only* in a sentence, the fact is important as regards English composition. Whether the right place for *only* has been so determined is a question that I shall not consider at present, but I will try to show by literary examples having a considerable range of time and character that the assumed misplacement of *only*, in the quotations given above as part of those cited by Dr. Hall, contravenes a rule of doubtful obligation. A single example is quoted from each author cited. The quotations are in the alphabetical order of the names of their authors.

"For a sound cause he could not fight, because there was none; he could only fight for the least bad of two unsound ones."—Matthew Arnold, *Mixed Essays* (New York, 1883), "Falkland."

"What I admire [said Mr. Phoebus] in the order [English nobility] to which you belong is that they do live in the air, that they excel in athletic sports, that they can only speak one language, and that they never read."—Beaconsfield, *Lothair*, ch. xxix.

"... they had only arrived two days before ..."—Walter Besant, *Armored of Lyonesse*, Part I., ch. iv.

"My boots have only been blackened once during the last two months."—Isabella L. Bird, *A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains*, Letter XII.

"It [Judith] was found in the same MS. as *Beowulf*, and of the twelve books in which it was originally written, we only possess the three last, ..."—Stopford Brooke, *Eng. Lit. Primer* (New York, 1894), sec. 10., p. 15.

"For my part I have ever believed, and do now know, that there are Witches: they that doubt of these, do not only deny *them*, but Spirits; and are obliquely and upon consequence a sort not of Infidels but Atheists."—Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici*, Part I, sec. xxx., p. 50., Golden Treasury Series.

"My Lord, I onely come to say, y'are welcome,  
And so must say, farewell."—

Chapman, *The Gentleman Usher*, Act I, sc. i,

(*The Comedies and Tragedies of George Chapman*, London, 1873).

"... also my lord Goring, then only called colonel Goring..."—Defoe, *Memoirs of a Cavalier* (Oxford, 1840), p. 196.

"We can only collect a few remaining features, which have lived through the collision of races..."—John Earle, *The Philology of the English Tongue*, 5th ed., sec. 571.

"The 'Night Thoughts' only differ from his [Young's] previous works in the degree and not in the kind of power they manifest."—George Eliot, *Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book* (2d ed., Edinburgh, 1884), p. 38.

"In 1525 Francis himself was taken prisoner at the battle of Pavia, and was only released, after consenting to a treaty (which he did not keep), by which he yielded many things to the Emperor."—Edward A. Freeman, *General Sketch of European History* (London, 1885), ch. xiii., sec. 8., p. 257.

"During peace these colonies have only experienced the advantages of union with us."—James Anthony Froude, *The English in the West Indies* (New York, 1888), p. 3.

"They [candles] were usually brought in with tea; but we only burned one at a time."—Mrs. Gaskell, *Cranford*, ch. v.

"... she asked him in an angry tone, what he did there; to which he only replied in an ironical way, by drinking her health."—Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, ch. xxi.

"A falsehood was to her [Elizabeth] simply an intellectual means of meeting a difficulty; and the ease with which she asserted or denied whatever suited her purpose was only equaled by the cynical indifference with which she met the exposure of her lies as soon as their purpose was answered."—J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People* (New York, 1882), ch. vii., sec. iii., p. 378.

"Mr. D'Israeli there [in *Curiosities of Literature*] calls the French *démoralisation* a 'barbarous term.' By this we are only to understand that he disrelished the political principles of its reputed author."—Fitzedward Hall, *Modern English* (New York, 1873), p. 42, foot-note.—This instance of the "misplacement" of *only* by Dr. Hall is exceptional.

"... but how completely Turner's conduct in this matter proves that he can only have been elected [Royal Academician] on his merits."—Philip Gilbert Hamerton, *The Life of J. M. W. Turner* (London, 1879), p. 51.

"... a knowledge of the world only means a knowledge of our own interest."—William Hazlitt, *On Knowledge of the World (Sketches and Essays)*, London, 1894., p. 123.

"There are peasant farmers and gentlemen farmers everywhere. But the man I have in my eye is only to be found at home."—T. E. Kebbel, *English Country Life* (London, 1891), p. 111.

"... that blind rancorous hatred of England that only reaches its full growth across the Atlantic."—Rudyard Kipling, *My Own People* (authorized ed., New York, 1891), *The Mutiny of the Mavericks*, p. 68.

"... the diffidence which becomes a judge who has only heard but one side."—Macaulay, *Bertrand Barère*.

"Their friendship had only lasted a year when she died..."—John Morley, *Critical Miscellanies* (London, 1888), vol. iii., p. 357.

"... but these excursive acts only occupied their leisure hours."—J. H. Newman, *Autobiographical Memoir* (London, 1890), ch. i.

"In London he had only had eyes for Susie Moore."—W. E. Norris, *Mrs. Fenton*, ch. x.

"He was, very deaf, and could only hear through a long trumpet and an india-rubber tube."—Marianne North, *Recollections of a Happy Life* (2d. ed., London, 1892), vol. ii., p. 131.

"... accused before the Venetian governor of treasonable practices, and only saved by the arrival of the great convoy from Venice..."—Mrs. Oliphant, *The Makers of Venice* (London, 1888), Part II., ch. ii., p. 176.

"... men ... who do not desire to steal baubles and common trash, but wish only to possess peculiar rarities..."—Sir Joshua Reynolds, "Twelfth Discourse" (*Literary Works*, London, 1879, vol. ii., p. 50).

"... you shall have this armour willingly, which I did only put on to do honor to the owner..."—Sir Philip Sidney, *Arcadia* (ed. 1598), p. 41.

"... but these [Hearts] are too perishable to preserve their Memories, which can only be done by the Pens of able and faithful Historians."—Swift, *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue* (second ed., London, 1712), p. 38.

"We have only had one really fine day."—John Addington Symonds, *In the Key of Blue*, etc. (London, 1893), p. 185.

"He knew all the best [billiard] tables in town, and the marker at Hunt's could only give him ten."—Thackeray, *The Ravenswing*, ch. i.

The collocation of *only* illustrated in the examples given above is infrequent in some of the works mentioned, but in most of them it occurs so often as to leave the impression that it is the commonest of the collocations in which *only* is used; its frequency is especially noticeable in writings that show spontaneity.

R. O. WILLIAMS.

New York City.

#### NOTES ON Fæder Larcwidas.

THESE notes pertain to the text of the poem

*Fæder Larcwidas* (*Des Vaters Lehren*) in Grein-Wülker, i, 353 f.

4.—*Do a þætte duge; deag þin gewyrhta*: This is the reading and punctuation I should adopt. *deag* is imperative (in harmony with *do*), and *gewyrhta* (gen. pl. limited by *þin*) represents the construction of *heaðoræsa* in *Beowulf* 526. This imperative *deag* is, presumably, an Anglian form; cf. North. *gionn* of the *Durham Ritual* (Lindelöf, p. 100).

5—7.—*wyrsan gewyrhta* (gen. pl.; cf. *Beowulf* 525) limits *feond*, just as *goda gehwylces* limits *frea and fultum*; *pam oþrum* is the generalized contrast to *þe*, as in 19–20 below.

17.—A comma, or, better still, a semi-colon, is required after *firene*.

23—26.—*gewuna wyrsa* (gen. pl.) characterizes *ængum* which is governed by the imperative *cahta*. Set in contrast to *ængum* is *anne . . . spella and lara* (gen. pl.) . . . *rædhycgende* (acc. sg.).

55.—*drymeð*, 'rejoices,' fittingly corresponds to the preceding *blissað*, for the contrast lies in the words *sorgful* and *sorgleas*. Grein's conjectured *drynman* is therefore to be cancelled.

62.—For *wene* I suggest *wend* (imperative).

64.—*syge*, read *sige*, 'victory, success.' The sure grounds of hope (*to hyhte*) and of success (*to sige*) are set forth.

67.—The reading of the MS., *nis*, notwithstanding the deleting dot, must be retained.

82.—*meahtum spedig*, relating to *gode* of the preceding line, is an interjected appellative; *gode*, therefore, is *Gode*. For *mon=mān* 'evil,' see *Beiträge* viii, 570.

85.—*him* (referring to either *grund* or *yrre*) *warna þe* (for *warnað þæt*). The imperative *warna* removes the impossible change of person.

93.—*ber breostcofan*. To accord with the preceding half-line (*leoht on gehygdum*), I suggest *beorht on breostcofan*.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

## BARLAAM AND JOASAPH IN SPAIN II.<sup>1</sup>

SALVÁ (No. 2106) in describing Medrano's *Silva Curiosa* (Paris, 1608)<sup>2</sup> says: "Los cuen-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, for January, 1895, pp. 11–17.

<sup>2</sup> See MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. x, col. 24, note 13.

tos están casi todos tomados del *Alivio de Caminantes*, de Timoneda." The writer might have added that these *cuentos* are reproduced almost literally. The following is a collation of both works, Timoneda's numbers are given according to Rivadeneira, vol. iii.

TIMONEDA.		MEDRANO.	
<i>Juan Arag.</i> ,	Cuento	3. page	127.
" "	"	5.	" 128.
" "	"	8.	" 129.
" "	"	9.	" 130.
" "	"	11.	" 131.
<i>Alivio</i> , part I	I	31.	" 142.
" " I	I	34.	" 143.
" " I	I	39.	" 144.
" " I	I	42.	" 144.
" " I	I	47.	" 145.
" " I	I	50.	" 145.
" " I	I	52.	" 146.
" " I	I	54.	" 146.
" " I	I	56.	" 137.
" " I	I	60.	" 146.
" " I	I	63.	" 147.
" " I	I	64.	" 152.
" " I	I	66.	" 147.
" " I	I	67.	" 147.
" " I	I	72.	" 148.
" " I	I	73.	" 148.
" " I	I	76.	" 148.
" " II	II	24.	" 132.
" " II	II	25.	" 132.
" " II	II	26.	" 133.
" " II	II	29.	" 133.
" " II	II	30.	" 134.
" " II	II	32.	" 134.
" " II	II	33.	" 134.
" " II	II	34.	" 135.
" " II	II	39.	" 135.
" " II	II	40.	" 135.
" " II	II	42.	" 135.
" " II	II	44.	" 136.
" " II	II	46.	" 136.
" " II	II	48.	" 137.
" " II	II	49.	" 138.
" " II	II	50.	" 138.
" " II	II	51.	" 139.
" " II	II	52.	" 139.
" " II	II	53.	" 71.
" " II	II	54.	" 140.
" " II	II	62.	" 140.



TIMONEDA.		MEDRANO.	
<i>Alivio</i> , part II	Cuento	63.	page 141.
"	" II "	67.	" 141.
"	" II "	68.	" 142.
"	" II "	72.	" 142.

The following are two passages from the MS. already described :3

Fol. xciv vº.—aquí comença el libro de la vida de berlan et del rrey iosapha de India sferuos et confesores de dios et de como el rrey de India martiriau los Xñanos et los monges et los hermitanos et los segudaua de su tierra et de como se torno Xriano el rrey iosapha et este mismo torno Xano despues al rrey auenir su padre parrofo primo,

Segund cuenta sant iohñ damasceno q fue griego muy sancto et muy sabedor que ouo escripto en griego esta vida de berlan et del rrey iosapha en el coimiesio q los monesterios se començaron aser fechos et se començaron de allegar por el mundo la muchedunbre delos om̃s que entravan monges et començarõ de ser publicadas por la tierra las buenas de las sus virtudes et de las sus sanctas vidas por tal guysa que lleo fasta en tierra de india et tornaron muchos de los indianos a voluntad de fazer aqlo mismo en q muchos dellos dexauã quãto abyau et ybanse para los desiertos et en el cuerpo mortal fazian alla vida de angeles. pues yendo asy a bien fecho de iro señor ihũ Xfo et sobfendo las almas de muchos a los cielos et resplandesciendo asy como con allas de oro leuantose vn rrey en aqlla tierra de India q abyau nonbre auenir et era muy rico rrey et poderoso a maravilla et vencedor desus hene (fol. xcv, rº) mĩgos et muy fuerte en batallas et era muy grande de cuerpo et de cara muy apuesta Et levantavose mucho en las bien andancas deste mundo que se secan et se pierden muy ayna. Et mas segund el alma estaua muy menguado ca lo tenien afogado muchos males. Et oyd en qual manera ca el era gẽtil et era muy llegado a la locura et ala crehencia et yerro delos ydolos et veuã sienpre en grandes delicias et dauase de todo en todo alos deleytes et placeres et vicios deste mundo. Mas como quyer que le no fallescia ninguna cosa de quantas el qria et et deseaua et codiciãua semejaue que avn menguaua vna cosa para ser acabada la su alegria Et aquella atormentaua la su anima de fierro guysa de muchos pensamientos Et esto era por q era manero ca no podia aver ningund fijo et por ende vyuia en muy grand cuydado et trabajauase mucho de como podiese ser suelto de tal enlagemento et fuese llamado padre de fijos que es cosa de muchos codiciada.

Fol. clxxxii vº.—de como conto theodas al

3 MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. x, col. 26, ii, a.

rrey del infante q estudo encerrado et le troxierõ despues todas las cosas et dixo q nõ ayua cosa q tan bien le paresciese como los diablos por las mugiers.

Ayua vn rrey dixo theodas q nõ podia aver fyo varon et era por ende muy triste et teniase por mal andante por ello et ayua muy grand tsteza. (Fol. clxxiii rº.) Et avynole asy que le nascio vn fyo et fue por ende muy alegre. Mas dixieronle los astrologos et los philosophos si aqñ niño vyese sol o fuego ante de diez años q pderia la vista de los ojos et cegaria ca e la su nascencia lo veyen. Qũdo el rrey oyo esto mando fazer vna grand cueua en vna peña et fizo ally meter asu fijo con sus amas por tal q nõ podiese ver claridat del sol fasta q fuesen conplidos los diez años Et desque fueron conplidos los diez años sacaron el moço de la cueua et nõ conosciã nĩguna cosa de las deste mundo et mĩdo el rrey que le pasasen por delante todas las cosas q podyesen aver en el su rreyno et q gelas mostrasen cada día por si et le diesen los nonbres q ayven et fezieronlo asy Et el infante estaua en vna altura nõ mucho grande et podia muy bien mirar toda cosa q pasase et estauan om̃s con el pa rresponder et dar rrespuesta a toda cosa q el preguntase et como pasauan las cosas asy ordenada mĩentre luego el infante dezia q cosa era aqlla. dezian tal cosa om̃s o mugieres o cavallos o vacas et asy de todas las otras cosas Et pasando las mugieres et las moças muy conpuestas endanta el infante demandò muy afincada mĩentre q cosa era o como ayvan nõbre Et vno delos q estaña conel dixo asy rreyendose como por burla señor an nõbre diablos q enganan a los om̃s. Et nõ se le olufdo al niño aquel nõbre q ally puso mas (fol. clxxiii, vº) el coracõ q las codiciãua mas q todas las otras cosas Et despues q todas las cosas fueron pasadas levaronlo al rrey su padre Et el rrey demandò q de todas a llas cosas ql le parescia mejor rrespõdio el infante nõ fue cosa q tan bien me paresciese nĩ q tanto codicifase pa mi como los diablos q enganan los om̃s cã nõ fue en toda cosa tan apuesta Et el rrey fue inaravillado ca non sabia avn por q cosa lo dezia Et señor ya tu biẽ sabes como trastorna al ome el amor de la mugier et nõ pienso q en otra manera puedas vencer tu fijo.4

4 To note 25 (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. x, Col. 26) add:

Vol. 176, Bibl. Stuttg. Lit. Ver. (Indices Libr. Prohib. des 16. Jahrh.), p. 234 (Index Valdes, 1559) gives date 1558.

By evident mistake we find p. 435 (Index Quiroga, 1583): *Flos Sanctorum* u. s. w. wie S. 234.

Likewise in *Index Libr.*, 1581:

*Flos Sanctorum impresso per Germañ Galharde, Çarag.*, 1558.

The *Index* of 1790, not to be depended on for its accuracy, gives:

*Flos Sanctorum*; en Zarag. 1566.

*Flos Sanctorum*, impr. por German Galharde.

Col. 31. iv. 1.

From the play by Villanueva Nuñez and Luna, I give as a specimen Barlaam's sermon to Josaphat.<sup>5</sup>

*Bar.* Bien decís, señor, que os muebe a oírme impulso diuino, pues de esse mismo obligado, vuestra atencion solicito A nueva doctrina os llamo, no os espante, que os afirmo, que si en tierra sazónada, cae la palabra, que intimo, en progressos de virtud, produce frutos opimos. Del retiro de mi cueba, que en la Tebaida de egipto me sirbe, contra el Demonio, de puerto, amparo, y assilo. De una inspiracion llamado, y de mi afecto mouido, sali, Señor, a buscaros, y por vos he padecido en mar, y en tierra, tormentas, uracanes, y peligros. Y por solo veros libre del error, en que remisso fluctuais, estoi gozoso, porque en mi miseria miro, que mas padecio mi Dios por voluernos a su aprisco. Y assi, porque en la razon rayen superiores visos de la verdad, que procuro; dexaros quisiera instruido de las dudas, que padege vuestro ingenio peregrino.

*Josaph.* Mas que el mismo desengaño, que espero, el amor estimo, con que por mi procurais por tan incultos caminos siendo el hilo la verdad dar salida al laberinto. Decidme varon piadoso. ay algun Dios, que benigno de Jupiter, Marte, Apolo, Venus, Minerua, y Cupido, exceda las excelencias?

*Bar.* Si lo ay, y en tan subido grado de excelencia, como excede el cielo al abismo. en hermosura; y este es un señor, que en el principio era sin principio Dios, y sin fin; pues infinito, aunque el discurso lo intente, no puede ser comprehendido. Criador Universal de quanto visible admiro, y inuisible; pues su diestra, aun fiat ha producido,

quanto en campos de zafir, ostentan astros, y signos, quanto en encrespadas olas, cifran viuientes marinos; quanto muestra en dulces aues, del ayre el cristal pulido; y quanto en brutos, y hombres, plantas, y tesoros ricos, ha producido la tierra; y assi, es error conocido dar la adoracion de Dioses, a unas cosas, que han deuido a este Dios, que he publicado, el ser, si alguno han tenido.

*Josaph.* Y dime no ay mas de un Dios?

*Bar.* No; pero ten aduertido que la diuinidad se halla en tres supuestos distintos que son, como la fee enseña, el Padre, el Verbo, el espiritu Santo; de modo, que el Padre origen, fuente, y principio de la Trinidad Sagrada, fecundo, fertil, y actiuo con inteleccion perfecta conociendose assi mismo; produce, un verbo, o concepto del entendimiento, viuio espexo de su bondad, y de su essencia expressiuo parto, que copia en su ser, todo el ser intelectiuo; El qual, o verbo, o concepto, es el que se llama hixo. Y el Padre, y el Hixo amantes reciprocamente unidos, mirandose en lo perfecto, igualmente parecidos: se aman tan estrechamente, con lazo tan indiuiso; que deste vinculo estrecho; procede, copiando al viuio toda la essencia de entrambos: un amor, tan encendido, que es la Tercera Persona; a quien la fee llama espritu Santo, sin que en esto aya duda, en qual es mas antiguo; pues Padre, Verbo, y Amor todo es, a un instante mismo.

*Josaph.* Por mas, que discurro atento, y cuidadoso escudriño, tanto misterio, no alcanzo?

*Bar.* En esso, esta lo diuino de la Trinidad Sagrada.

*Josaph.* Pues no implica en buen juicio, que tres sujetos diuersos sean uno solo?

*Bar.* Admito; que regularmente hablando es assi, mas ya se han visto,

<sup>5</sup> MOD. LANG. NOTES, January 1895.

al poder grande de Dios,  
los impossibles vençidos.  
Mas, que la experiencia enseña  
que si a un espexo bruñido  
hieren los rayos del sol  
se dibuxa en el al uiuo  
su imagen, y si formando  
reflexos y airosos bispos  
esta biolencia del sol  
del espexo producido  
hiere una fuente, sus rayos  
hallan abierto camino  
aora segunda expression  
de su ser, y a un tiempo mismo  
bera quien lo mire atento  
tres soles, y aunque distintos  
parezcan la uerdad muestra  
que son los tres uno mismo  
luego si se puede ber  
en el sol con artificio  
experiencia semejante  
quanto mexor en Dios mismo  
se podra ber, que su ser  
es quanto ser ha podido.

*Josap.* Tus razones me conuenzen  
mas fuera del silogismo  
quien esta berdad apoya?

*Bar.* El Euangelio de Christo.

*Josap.* Quien da fe de lo que encierra

*Bar.* quatro abonados testigos,  
que secretarios del Cielo,  
dan testimonio.

*Josap.* Soi digno  
de leerlo?

*Bar.* Si, mas non puede  
entender su alto sentido  
quien no sea.

*Josap.* que?

*Bar.* Christiano.

*Josap.* que hare para conseguirlo?

*Bar.* Baptizaros en el agua.

*Josap.* Que assegura esse baptismo?

*Bar.* Consequir la vida eterna.

*Josap.* De donde al agua le vino,  
el poder saluar los hombres?

*Bar.* De aquel valor infinito  
dela sangre que Dios hombre  
derramo, por redimirnos,  
quando en una cruz murio.

*Josap.* Dios morir? que desuario!  
deidad, y muerte no implican?

*Bar.* Si gran Señor, mas Dios quiso  
sugetandose a la muerte;  
no, como verbo diuino,  
pues esse morir no puede,  
Si, tomando en si el vestido

del ser humano, que fue  
hecho, bordado, y tegido  
por el espiritu Santo  
de los candidos arminios,  
de la virginal pureza  
de la Reyna del Ymperio  
Maria Señora Nuestra,  
dar a la vida principio.

*Josap.* Y quien la vida estrago?

*Bar.* La muerte.

*Josap.* La muerte has dicho?  
que es la muerte, que me pasma  
solo el nombre repetido?

*Bar.* Muerte es un comun achaque  
infausto, que contrahimos,  
desde que en Adan pecamos;  
de cuyos sangrientos filos,  
no se reserva el Monarca  
por poderoso, no el rico  
por sus tesoros, no el pobre  
por su miseria, no el niño  
por su tierna edad, pues todos  
quando nacemos morimos;  
justa pena de un pecado,  
y de una culpa castigo.

*Josap.* decidme mas, porque el alma  
consigue ufana, el aliuio,  
quando de tus labios pende;  
Padre amado,

Sale un Criado.

Parable 1, 'Todestrompete und Kästchen,'  
runs as follows in Torquemada, *Coloquios  
satiricos* (Bilbao, 1584).

... una nouela, que quando niño me acuerdo  
q me contaron. Vn rey que vuo en los tiêpos  
antiguos (de cuyo nombre no têgo memoria)  
tuuo vn criado q le siruio muchos años, cõ aql  
cuydadado y fidelidad q tenia obligaciõ, y  
viêdose ya en la vejez, y q otros muchos q no  
le auia seruido tâto tiêpo, ni tâbien, auia  
receuido grandes premios y mercedes por sus  
seruicios, y que el solo nunca auia sido  
gualardonado, ni el Rey le auia hecho merced  
ninguna, acordando de yrse a su tierra, y  
passar la vida que le quedaua en grãgear vn  
poco de hazienda que tenia. Para esto pidio  
liceçia, y se partio, y el rey le mando dar vna  
mula en que fuesse: y quedo considerãdo que  
nunca auia dado nada a aquel criado suyo, y  
que teniendo razõ de agrauiarse, se yua sin  
auer le dicho ninguna palabra. Y para experi-  
mêtar mas su paciência embio otro criado suyo,  
q haziendose encõtradize con el, fuesse en su  
compañia dos o tres jornadas, y procurasse de  
entender si se tenia por agrauiado. El criado  
lo hizo assi, y por mucho que hizo nũca pudo  
saber lo que sentia, mas de que passando por  
vn arroyo la mula se paro a orinar enel, y



dandole con las espuelas, dixo: harre alla mula de la condiciõ de su dueño, que da dõde no ha de dar. Y passando de la otra parte, aquel criado del rey que le seguia, saco una cedula suya, por la qual le mandaua que se voluiesse, y el lo hizo luego. Y puesto en la presençia del rey (el qual estaua ya informado de lo q auia dicho) le pregunto la causa que le auia mouido a dezir aquello. El criado le respondio diziendo: yo señor os he seruido mucho tiempo lo mejor y mas lealmente que he podido, nunca me aueys hecho merced ninguna, y a otros que no os hã seruido, les aueys hecho muchas y muy grãdes mercedes, siendo mas ricos, y que teniã menos necesidad que yo. Y assi dixẽ que la mula era de vuestra condiciõ, que daua donde no auia de dar, pues daua agua al agua, que no lo auia menester, y dexaua de darla donde auia necesidad della, que era en la tierra. El rey le respondio: piensas que tenga yo todo la culpa? La mayor parte tiene tu ventura, no quiero dezir dicha o desdicha, porq de verdad estos son nombres vanos, mas digo vêtura, o tu negligencia o mal acertamiento fuera de sazõ, y oportunidad. Y porque lo creas, quiero que hagas la esperiencia dello. Y assi le metio en vna camara, y le mostro dos arcas yguales y igualmente aderezadas, diziendole: la vna esta llena de moneda y joyas de oro y plata, y la otra de arena: escoge vna dellas, que aquella lleuaras. El criado despues de auerlas mirado muy bien, escogio la de la arena. Y entonces el rey le dixo. Bien has visto que la fortuna te haze el agrauio tambien como yo pero yo quiero poder esta vez mas q la fortuna, y assi le dio la otra arca rica, cõ que fue bien auenturado.

Parable 5, "Love for women," as found in Villegas, *Fructus Sanctorum*. fo. 355, v<sup>o</sup>.

Criose en el desierto y en religion desde que se aparto de los pechos de su ama un moço, y siendo de quinze años lleuole vna vez su Abad a la ciudad, donde viendo en vna calle que estauan baylando ciertas mugeres pregunto al Abad que era aquello. Respondiole, que eran anades. Buelto al monasterio, estaua triste, el Abad le pregunto la causa de su tristeza, y con que se alegraria Respondio el con toda la sinceridad possible, que con las anades que vido en la ciudad. El Abad hablo con sus monges y dioxles: Considerando hijos mios atentamẽte quan peligrosa sea la vista de las mugeres, pues este moço que nunca vido alguna dellas, criado en el desierto entre religiosos, de auerlas vna vez visto se esta abrasando en cõcupiscencia. Daud que puso libremente los ojos en vna muger, y comito adulterio y homicidio. Quien abra que presuma de si que puede verlas y comunicarlãs frequentemente sin daño?

Bien parecido es a lo que se dize de cierto Rey que le nacio vn hijo, y echando juyzio algunos Astrologos en su nacimiento (aunque con vanidad y falsamẽte por ser negocio reprouado) dixerõle que si en diez años veyã la luy del Sol, moriria. El por les dar credito hizole criar dentro de vna Cueva. Y pasado este tiempo, salio el moço, y admirauase de todo lo que veyã: vido mugeres galanas y pregunto que cosa eran. Y con malicia respondieron, que eran demonios que lleuauan almas al infierno para ser atormentadas con fuego. Estando despues en presençia del Rey su padre, y preguntãdole, que de lo que auia visto que era lo que mejor le parecia y agradaua mas. El respondio: que los demonios que lleuauan almas al infierno: Vease la fuerça que haze la vista de mugeres. Lo dicho se refiere en el Promptuario de exemplos.

F. DEHAAN.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### NOTE ON FOLSIFIE

##### *And Similar Expressions in Old-French Literature.*<sup>1</sup>

A favorite caprice of French authors during the Middle Ages was the formation of humorous compounds to designate some neat turn of thought, such as we find portrayed in the four nouns of similar formation which will be treated in the present article. The words in question are the following:

- A. Folsifie;
- B. Folsibee;
- C. Folsiprend;
- D. Follilaisse.

The orthography of these words varies much as preserved in the monuments of the older literature; but the popular etymology at the bottom of all of them is very evident even to the most casual observer, though the range of meaning which they include is quite extensive, as will appear from the following material. They will be taken up in the order given above.

#### A. FOLSIFIE.

This word, and expressions closely resembling it, occurs in the following works:

<sup>1</sup> The attempt has been made to attain as nearly as possible to completeness for the Old-French period only; for the modern language the dictionaries may be consulted with profit, *s. v.* sot-l'y-laisse.

- I. Philippe de Rheims, *Blonde d'Oxford*;
- II. Moniot, *Le Dit de Fortune*;
- III. *La Roe de Fortune*;
- IV. Rusteuf, *La Voie de Paradis*;
- V. Anonymous satire on the times;
- VI. *De Guersay*;
- VII. *La Vie de Saint Alexi*;
- VIII. *L'Évangile aux Femmes*;
- IX. P. Fabre d'Uzes, *Loc Es*;
- X. *Ysopet de Lyon: Dou Cheual et de l'Asne*;
- XI. Jehan de Meung, *Roman de la Rose*;
- XII. Cadenet, *L'Autrier*;
- XIII. Nicole Bozon, *Contes Moralisés*;
- XIV. *L'Évangile aux Femmes (bis.)*

I. Philippe de Rheims, *Blonde d'Oxford*  
(anc. B. N. f. 7609. 2), vv. 2210-2216:<sup>2</sup>

Ele n'avoit mie autel cuer  
Comme maintes femmes par le mont,

2 a. Printed in: *The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin*, by Philippe de Reimes, a trouvère of the thirteenth century. Edited from the unique MS. in the Imperial Library in Paris, by M. Le Roux de Lincy. Printed for the Camden Society (Vol. 72), 1858. 8vo, xxvii and 214pp. See p. 77.

b. Printed in: *Dictionnaire de la Langue Française*, par M. É. Littré. Tome Deuxième. Paris, Hachette, 1874. s. v. fou: hist. xiii s.

c. Printed in: 'Bulletin de la Société Historique de Compiègne,' vol. iii (1876): M. Léopold Constans, *Marie de Compiègne d'après l'Évangile aux Femmes*.

d. This article was also published separately as: *Marie de Compiègne d'après l'Évangile aux Femmes*, texte publié pour la première fois dans son intégrité d'après les quatre manuscrits connus des xiii<sup>e</sup>, xiv<sup>e</sup> et xve siècles, avec un commentaire philologique (et) grammatical, et une dissertation sur l'origine probable de ce fabliau, par M. Constans, Professeur Agrégé au Lycée de Sens. Paris, Vieweg, 1876. 8vo, 86 pp.

P. 34, the author prints the following verse from MS. A:

Bien doit estre apielee: "J'ai a non Fausifie."

To this he has the foot-note:

"B: *J'ai a non faus s'y fie*, et C: *J'ai a nom fol s'y fie*. Ces deux leçons, décomposant le mot, en donnent la signification. *Faus* est une forme assez rare, même au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle. Cependant on rencontre dans le roman de *Blonde et Jehan*, par Philippe de Rheims, ces vers qu'on peut rapprocher de notre texte:

Com maintes femmes par le mont (le monde)

Qui coraiges remuans . . .

Tels femmes ont non Faus s'y fie.

Au moyen-âge, ces noms allégoriques étaient fort à la mode, surtout dans les mystères."

e. Referred to in: *Lyoner Ysopet*, Altfranzösische Übersetzung des xiii. Jahrhunderts in der Mundart der

Qui coraiges remuans ont;  
Et tout aussi les vont tornant  
Commes li cokes torne au vent;  
Tels femmes ont non: "Fausifie";  
Blonde tele estre ne volt mie.<sup>3</sup>

II. Moniot, *Le Dit de Fortune*, (B. N. f. 837, anc. 7218, f0247vo-f0248vo):<sup>4</sup>

Ainsi est de Fortune, seignor, je le vous afie,  
Ne porquant n'a Fortune ne cors, ne cuer, ne fie.

Je li donrai .i, non, bien droit a ceste fie:  
Si le nommera l'en de par moi: "Folssyfie."

Franche-Comté; mit dem kritischen Text des lateinischen Originals (sog. *Anonymus Neveleti*); zum erstenmal herausgegeben von Dr. Wendelin Foerster, Heilbronn, Henninger, 1882. (*Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, herausgegeben von Dr. Wendelin Foerster: Fünfter Band.) 12mo, xlv and 166 pp.

Among the notes on the text, is given the following on p. 152:

"2357 *Fox-est-qui-s'i-fie*, der ganze Satz substantivisiert und dient als Namenbezeichnung. Vgl. die Beispiele welche Tobler, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1877, S. 1625.6 zu Bast. v. Bouillon 5129 gebracht hat. Füge hinzu Folz-i-bée Brun 3749, wo Baud. Seb. i, 141 zitiert wird, Rusteuf ii, 436 s. Anm. 2 (=Jubinal, Nouv. Rec. ii, 418), Blonde d'Oxf. S. 77\*  
\*Vgl. jetzt Tobler, Sitz. -ber. Berl. Akad. xxvi, 546."

3 In giving the Old-French text in the main portion of the following remarks, the punctuation as found in the MSS. and editions cited has been changed in many instances in order to secure uniformity. The MSS. that are referred to are known to me only through copies and editions.

4 a. Printed in: *Nouveau Recueil de Contes, Dits, Fabliaux et Autres Pièces Inédites des xii<sup>e</sup>, xiv<sup>e</sup> et xve Siècles*, pour faire suite aux collections Legrand D'Aussy, Barbazan et Méon, mis au jour pour la première fois par M. Achille Jubinal, d'après les MSS. de la Bibliothèque du Roi. Tome i, Paris, Pannier, 1839. 8vo, vii and 387 pp. Tome ii, Paris, Challamel, 1842. 8vo, vii and 444 pp.

Vol. i, pp. 195-198: *Le Dit Moniot de Fortune*. MS. 7218. See p. 198.

b. Printed in: *Œuvres Complètes de Rutebeuf*, trouvère du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle, recueillies et mises au jour pour la première fois par M. Achille Jubinal. Tome ii, Paris, Pannier, 1839. 8vo, 525 pp.

Vol. ii, pp. 435-439, under the rubric "Additions," is given the poem "De Guersay." In this poem (pp. 436-437) a passage occurs containing the word: "*Fols-s'i-fie*"; to this the following foot-note is given:

"Cette expression, employée dans le sens que lui donne ici le trouvère, est assez fréquente dans les poésies du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle. On lit dans *Le Dit de Fortune*, par Moniot, où, soit dit en passant, se trouve ce vers pillé plus tard par Villon:

Bientost porra sa goule savoir que son cul poise,  
On lit, dis-je, la strophe suivante:



Ainsi est de Fortune, seignor, je le vous asie,  
Ne porquant n'a Fortune ne cors, ne cuer, ne fie.  
Je li donrai .i. non, bien droit a ceste fie:  
Si le nommera l'en de par moi *fols-s'y-fie*."

P. 506, under the rubric "Table des Matières," is given the further note:

"*Fol-s'y-fie*. Nom employé souvent par les trouvères comme celui d'un personnage allégorique, p. 436, t. ii."

- c. These two notes are reprinted in: *Œuvres Complètes de Rutebeuf*, trouvère du xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle, recueilles et mises au jour pour la première fois par M. Achille Jubinal, Ancien Député. Nouvelle édition, revue et corrigée. Tome ii, Paris, Daffis (éditeur-propriétaire de la *Bibliothèque Elzévirienne*), 1874. 12mo, 436 pp. Tome ii, 1875.

The passage in question now appears on pp. 348-349, and we read: "...écrit aussi plus tard par Villon:" The second note is now found on p. 410.

- d. Printed in: *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, unter der Aufsicht der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. (Jahrgang) 1877, Göttingen. 12mo, xxi and 1664 pp. (in two vols.). Stück 51, 19. Dec.; pp. 1601-1630: Prof. Adolf Tobler, in a review of *Li Bastars de Buillon* (faisant suite au roman de *Baudouin de Sebourg*), poème du xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle, publié pour la première fois d'après le manuscrit unique de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, par M. Aug. Scheler. Bruxelles, Closson, 1877. 8vo, xxxiii and 341 pp.

PP. 1625-1626 the following remark occurs:

"Z. 5129. Die zum Substantiv gewordene Phrase *fous i bee* unserer dichter stellt sich neben die ebenso gebrauchte *fous s'i fie*. Diese findet sich z. B. an folgenden Stellen: *Bien doit (femme) estre apelee: j'ai a non fous s'i fie*, Jub. Jongl. 28; *Fols s'i fie est nommez a droit (li siecles)*, eb. 178. *Si le (Fortune) nommera l'en de par moi fols s'i fie*, Jub. NRec. 1 198; *Il ont non fol s'i fie, s'a droit les apelon*, eb. II 336 Amn., auch Bartsch Chr. pr. 3,60, 6."

This note by Prof. Tobler is referred to by him (see note 6. c); and by Prof. Förster (see note 2. e).

- e. Referred to by Prof. Förster (see note 2. e).  
f. Printed in: *Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française*, et de tous ses dialectes, du ix<sup>e</sup> au xve siècle, par M. Frédéric Godefroy. Tome iv, Paris, Vieweg, 1885, 4to, 798 pp. P. 47, s. v. *fol*. The writer gives the following quotations:

"—*Fol i bee*, locution designant un sot déçu dans ses projets:

Corsabrin s'en reva pardevers sa contree,  
Sousprendre nous cuïdoit a cheste matinee;  
Mais on le doit clamer par rayson *Fous i bee*.  
(*Bast. de Bouillon*, 5126, Scheler.)

Por ce a non li mont *Fol i bee*.

(*De St. Alexis*, 278, Romania, viii, 169.)

Sire, dist la pucelle, non avez *Fox i bee*,  
Venus estez trop tart, li heure est ja passee.  
(*B. de Seb.*, V, 634, Bocca.)

—On trouve *fol i vee*, par altération de la locution *fol i bee*:

Et si vous doit bien souvenir  
Des maux qu'on a veu advenir  
A maint prince de renommee,  
Pour ce qu'ilz vouloient offrir

### III. *La Roe de Fortune*, (B. N. f. 837, anc. 7218, foz19).5

Cis siecles maint homme deçoit:  
"Folssifie" est nommez a droit;  
Por ce le doit chascun despire.

### IV. *Rustebeuf, La Voie de Paradis*, (B. N. f. 837, anc. 7218, foz309v) fo 314, vv. 497-504.6

Ci a felonnesse espousee:  
Sa chamberiere a non: "Rousee,"  
Et ses chambellenz: "Faussifie."  
Or ne sai que ce senefie,  
Quar tant de gent la vont veoir  
Qu'a granz paines ont ou seoir:  
Li .i. s'en vont, li autre vient,  
Li revenant por fol se tienent.

Leur amour a ceulx qui souffrir  
Vouloient en mainte contree  
Leur contraire; faulse pensee  
Estoit en eulx; dont *fol y vee*  
Puis bien ceulx nommer sans mentir  
Que si ont leur amour donnee  
A ceulx qu'onques nulle journee  
N'orent vouloir de bien servir.  
(Ms. Genève 179bis, Ritter, *Poés. des xiv<sup>e</sup> et xv<sup>e</sup> s.*, p. 31).

—*Fols s'i fie*, qualifie la fortune, le monde et la santé, auxquels on ne peut se fier sans folie:

C'est mauves geus que gloutenie:  
Nus n'en devroit avoir envie,  
Quar cest siecle n'est pas estable;  
Je di qu'il a non *Fols s'i fie*:  
Nus n'i set terme de sa vie,  
Prince ne roi, ne conestable.  
(*De Guersay*, Richel. 837, foz38a.)

Ainsi est de Fortune, seignor, jel vous asie,  
Ne porquant n'a fortune ne cors, ne cuer, ne fie.  
Je li donrai .i. non, bien droit a ceste fie:  
Si le nommera l'en de par moi *fols s'i fie*.  
(Moniot, *le Dit de Fortune*, Jub., *Nouv. Rec.*, i, 198).

Por ce a non li mont "Fol i bee"  
Et santé d'ome "*Fol s'i fie*,"  
Et sa joie "Chace folie."  
(*De St. Alexis*, 278, Romania viii, 172).

- 5 a. Printed in: *Jongleurs et Trouvères, ou choix de sa-luts, épîtres, rîveries et autres pièces légères des xiii<sup>e</sup> et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles*; publié pour la première fois par M. Achille Jubinal, d'après les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi. Paris, Merklein, 1835. 8vo, 190 pp. PP. 177-181: *La Roe de Fortune*. See p. 178.

b. Printed by Prof. Tobler (see note 4. d.)

c. Referred to by Prof. Gustav Gröber (cf. below, note 11, e). See p. 468.

- 6 a. Printed by M. Jubinal, *Rutebeuf*, first ed. (see note 4. b), vol. ii, pp. 24-55: *La Voie de Paradis, ou ci commence la Voie d'Umilitei*. Mss. 7218, 7633, 7632. See p. 42; to this is given the note: "Ms. 7633. Var. Touz-s'i-fie."

b. Printed also by M. Jubinal, *Rutebeuf*, second ed. (see note 4. c), vol. ii, pp. 169-203; the note on p. 189 gives the variant as: "Fouz-s'i-fie."

c. Referred to by Prof. Tobler, *Sitzungsberichte der*



V. Anonymous satire on the times (anc. B. N. suppl. franç. 1132, fo23vo).<sup>7</sup>

Les fames sont diverses et li homme felon:  
Pour ce s'entr'aiment-il des amours Guenelon:  
Agnès n'aime Hubert, non fait Perrot Belon:  
Il ont non: "Folsifie," s'a droit les apelon.

VI. *De Guersay* (B. N. f. 837, anc. 7218, fo238a), vv. 41-47.<sup>8</sup>

*Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaft. ten zu Berlin*, Jahrgang 1882. 8vo, x, 1222 and 46 pp.

Stück xxvi, pp. 531-559: *Verblümter Ausdruck und Wortspiel in Altfranzösischer Rede*, von Herr Adolf Tobler. On p. 546 the writer has the following remarks:

"*Fous i bee*. Im Baudouin de Sebourc sagt die schöne Elienor zu einem unwillkommenen Bewerber: *Sire,—nom avez 'Fox i bee'; 'Venus estes trop tart, li heure est ja passee; Bien sai que vous avés fait a le donnee*, 5, 634; den gleichen Ausdruck braucht der Bastard de Bouillon 5129: *Corsabrin's s'en reva pardevers sa contree,—Sausprendre nous cuidoit a cheste matinee; Mais on le doit clamer par rayon 'Fous i bee'*. Wird hier der Name Personen beigelegt, die als Narren nach dem getrachtet haben, was ihnen versagt geblieben ist, so erhält ihn dagegen in der von G. Paris, Rom. viii 169 herausgegebenen Alexiuslegende die Welt, als Ziel des Trachtens der Thoren. Hier sagt der Dichter: der Tod lässt in nichts zurücksinken und gleich Wind und Rauch vergehn, was einer lebenslang mit Mühe und Sorge zustande gebracht hat; *Por ce a non li mont 'Fol i bee', Et sants d'ome 'Fol s'i fie', Et sa joie 'chace folie'* (der dem Thürich-ten nachjagt), 278.

*Fous s'i fie*, das uns eben im Alexius begegnete, kehrt an zahlreichen andern Stellen wieder. Zu den von mir in den Gött. Gel. Anz. 1877 S. 1625 beigebrachten Belegen, wo wir einmal das Weib, dann die Welt, dann das Glück, endlich die Männer (in ihrem Verhalten zu den Weibern) so benannt finden, füge ich noch Ruteb. 2, 42, wo der Luxuria ein Kämmerer dieses Namens beigelegt wird.—Mit diesen beiden Namen vergleicht man passend den Mädchennamen *Fol s'i prent* im Fouque de Candie S. 77."

This discussion by Prof. Tobler is referred to by Prof. Förster (see note 2, e.)

7 a. Printed by M. Jubinal, *Nouv. Rec.* (see note 4 a), vol. ii, pp. 334-335: *Le Dit des Femmes*, Ms. de la Bibliothèque harléienne 2253. To this he gives, on p. 335, the following note:

"Le Ms. 1132, Suppl. franç., fol. 23vo. attribue aussi les fautes des femmes aux maris en ces termes:

Tant de durtes diverses leur monstrent a voir dire  
... Les fames sont diverses et li homme felon:  
Pour ce s'entr'aiment-il des amours Guenelon:  
Agnès n'aime Hubert, non fait Perrot Belon:  
Il ont non *fol-si-fie*, s'a droit les apelon."

(No title is given to this poem).

b. Printed by Prof. Tobler, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* (see note 4. d).

8 a. Printed by M. Jubinal, *Rutebeuf*, first ed. (see note 4 b), vol. ii, pp. 435-439.

b. M. Jubinal, *Nouv. Rec.* (see note 4 a), vol. ii, p. 418, gives an additional note in correction of his text in the work just referred to, as follows:

"Idem, p. 436, dans la première strophe, il faut

C'est mauves geus que gloutenie:  
Nus n'en devroit avoir envie,  
Quar cest siecle n'est pas estable,  
Je di qu'il a non "Folssifie":  
Et puis reva veir l'estable,  
Nus n'i set terme de sa vie,  
Prince, ne roi, ne conestable.

VII. *La Vie de Saint Alexi*, (B. N. f. 25408, fo32c-fo32d), vv. 275-282.9

"... Et fet revenir a neent,  
Et esvanoir comme fume.  
Por ce a non li mont: "Folibee,"  
Et santé d'ome: "Folsifie,"  
Et sa joie: "Chacefolie."  
Dahez ait fruit qui ne meure, (fo32d).  
Et folie qui toz jorz dure."

VIII. *L'Évangile aux Femmes*: in this poem the word occurs in somewhat varying orthography and connection in certain of the versions, while in others the passage in question is lacking:

a. Version A 20 (B. N. f. 1553, anc. 7593, fo519d):<sup>10</sup>

Bien doit estre apielee: "l'ai a nom Fausifie."

b. Version B 20 (B. N. f. 837, anc. 7218, fo201d):<sup>11</sup>

ajouter ce vers après le quatrième:

Et puis reva veir l'estable."

c. Printed also by M. Jubinal, *Rutebeuf*, second ed. (see note 4 c), vol. iii, pp. 347 ff.

d. Referred to by Prof. Förster (see note 2 e).

e. Printed by M. Godefroy (see note 4 f).

9 a. Printed (no doubt) by M. Hippeau, *Mémoires de l'Académie de Caen*, 1856, p. 234 ff., in his edition of the poem in question. (cf. *Ro.* viii 166).

b. Printed by M. Gaston Paris, *Romania* viii (1879), pp. 163-180: *La Vie de Saint Alexi en Vers Octosyllabiques*. See p. 172.

c. Printed by Prof. Tobler, *Sitz. -ber.* (see note 6 c).

d. Printed by M. Godefroy (see note 4 f).

10 Printed by M. Constans, *M. de C.* (see note 2. d.)

11 a. Copied in *Ars*, f. 2765, fo110v; to this there is given the marginal note: *fol qui s'y fie quel qu'il soit* (probably written by the hand of M. de Sainte-Palaye: cf. M. Jubinal, *Yongl. et Trouv.*, p. 14).

b. Printed by M. Jubinal, *Yongl. et Trouv.* (see note 5. a), p. 28.

c. Printed by M. Constans, *M. de C.* (see note 2. d).

d. Printed by Prof. Tobler, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* (see note 4. d).

e. Printed by Prof. Gröber, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* vi (1882), pp. 467-469, in his review

Bien doit estre apelee: "J'ai a non Faussifie."

- c. Version C 56 (B. N. f. 1593, anc. 7615, f99d):<sup>12</sup>

Bien puet estre appelée: "J'ay a nom Folsyfie."

- d. Version E 4 (Épinal, bibl. mun. 189, anc. 59, f37ro):<sup>13</sup>

Bien doit lvy homme appelle: "Folsifie."

- e. Version J 12 (Berne, B. Bongarsiana 205, f378a):<sup>14</sup>

Bien doit estre appelez: "Jehanninet Folsifie."

IX. We are probably justified in regarding the following passage from one of the celebrated poems of the troubadours as a progenitor of the later nominal compound:

P. Fabre d'Uzes, *Loc Es*:<sup>15</sup>

Fols qui vol dir totz sos vers,  
E fols qui en fol se fia;  
Fols qui falh e no s'castia,  
E fols qui sec totz sos volers.

X. Another somewhat similar case is the following Old-French phrase:

*Ysopet de Lyon*, (Acad. de Lyon 57, f61ro),

vv. 2349-2358:<sup>16</sup>

xxxxv. *Dou Cheual et de l'Asne*.

... Es biens dou monde ne te croire,  
Quar fortune n'est onques uoire.

of: E. Wölfflin, *Ueber die Allitterirenden Verbindungen der Lateinischen Sprache* (*Sitzungsberichte der königl. bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften*. Hist.-phil. Cl. 1881, vol. ii, pp. 1-93). See p. 468.

<sup>12</sup> a. Copied in Ars. f. 2768, f3127ro; to this there is given the characteristic marginal note: *façon de parler* (probably by M. de Sainte-Palaye, as above).

b. Printed by M. Constans, *M. de C.* (see note 2. d).

<sup>13</sup> Printed by the writer, *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, vol. viii (1893), cols. 93-96: *A Hitherto Unpublished Text of the "Évangile aux Femmes."* See col. 94.

<sup>14</sup> Unpublished. Versions D, F, G and H do not contain this passage.

<sup>15</sup> Printed in: *Lexique Roman, ou Dictionnaire de la Langue des Troubadours*, comparée avec les autres langues de l'Europe latine, par M. Raynouard. Tome iii, Paris, Silvestre, 1840. 8vo, 611 pp. See p. 348, s. v. *fol*; of this passage the writer gives the following translation:

"*Fou* qui veut dire tous ses vers, et *fou* qui en *fou* se fie; *fou* qui manque et ne se châtie, et *fou* qui suit tous ses vœux."

<sup>16</sup> Printed by Prof. Förster (see note 2 e), pp. 61-63.

Ele est muable et s'est diuerse,  
Ele est cruere et s'est peruerse.  
Por ce l'apele l'on fortune,  
Qu'ale ne set onques estre une.  
Quant plus de grace te promest,  
Adonques au desoz te mest.  
Ele ai non: "Folx-est-qui-s'i-fie,"  
Quar ne fait chose qu'ele die.

Of other passages in which the similarity is more or less striking, I am able to cite the following;

XI. Jehan de Meung, *Roman de la Rose*, vv. 1303-1304:<sup>17</sup>

Diex, cum menoient bonne vie!  
Fox est qui n'a de tel envie.

XII. (*Prov.*) Cadenet, *L'Autrier*:<sup>18</sup>

Es errors  
E dobla folia,  
Qui en lor se fia.

XIII. Nicole Bozon, *Contes Moralisés*:<sup>19</sup>

Fols est qe se affie  
en autres apres sa vie,  
e lest sa alme nuwe  
pur mettre en estrange muwe.

XIV. *L'Évangile aux Femmes* (bis):

a. Version A 47 (B. N. f. 1553, anc. 7593, f520a):<sup>20</sup>

Et coi c'on die d'eles, faus est qui ni s'i fie.

b. Version B 43 (B. N. f. 837, anc. 7218, f202a):<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> a. Printed in: *Le Roman de la Rose*, par Guillaume de Lorris et Jean de Meung. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée par Francisque Michel. Tome 1. Paris: Didot, 1864. 8vo, lxii and 363 pp. See p. 43.

b. Printed by M. Littré (see note 2. b), s. v. *fou*: hist. xlii s.

<sup>18</sup> Printed by M. Raynouard (see note 15), p. 349, s. v. *folia*; of this he gives the following translation:  
"C'est erreur et double folie, qui en eux se fie."

<sup>19</sup> Printed in: *Les Contes Moralisés de Nicole Bozon, Frere Mineur*; publiés pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de Londres et de Cheltenham, par L. Toulmin Smith et Paul Meyer. Paris, Didot, 1889. 8vo, lxxiv and 333 pp. (*Société des Anciens Textes Français*). See p. 44; we find on p. xxi the following remark:

"Si on examine la rédaction de certaines fables ou de certains récits qui, sans être proprement des fables, peuvent avoir été compris dans un recueil d'apologues, on y reconnaîtra comme des débris de vers, reconnaissables aux rimes. Ainsi:

P. 44. Fols est qe se affie en autres apres sa vie, e lest sa alme nuwe pur mettre en estrange muwe.  
Il suffirait de peu de changements pour restituer quatre vers de six syllabes."

<sup>20</sup> Unpublished.

<sup>21</sup> a. Copied in Ars. f. 2765, f202o.

Et quoi c'om die d'eles, fols est qui ne s'i fie.

- c. Version C 95 (B. N. f. 1593, anc. 7615, fo100b):<sup>22</sup>

Et quoy qu'on die d'elles, folz est qui ne s'y fie.

- d. Version D 27 (Dijon, bibl. mun. 298bis, fo114ro):<sup>23</sup>

Car en quant qu'elles dient, fols est qui ne s'i fie.

- e. Version E 19 (Épinal, bibl. mun. 189, anc. 59, fo37ro):<sup>24</sup>

Ka c'on die d'elle, fol est que ne s'i fie.

- f. Version G 11 (Basel, Univ.-Bibl. unnumbered, fo2vo):<sup>25</sup>

Car ad ce qu'elles dyent, fol est qui ny s'i fy.

- g. Version H 32 (Chantilly, fr. 1578, fo214b):<sup>26</sup>

Et que qu'on die d'elles, chacun le qui s'i fie.

- h. Version J 67 (Berne, B. Bongarsiana 205, fo379a):<sup>27</sup>

Et quoy c'om dye d'elles, chascuns autant si c'y fie.

#### B. FOLSIBEE.

This word occurs in the following works:

- I. *Bauduin de Sebourc*;
- II. *Li Bastars de Buillon*;
- III. *Brun de la Montaigne*;

b. Printed by M. Jubinal, *Jongl. et Trouv.*, p. 29.

c. Printed by M. Constans, *M. de C.* (see note 2. d), p. 42.

- 22 a. Copied in Ars. f. 2768, fo127vo.

b. Unpublished.

- 23 a. Printed by M. Constans, *M. de C.*, p. 42.

b. Printed by Prof. Eduard Mall, 'Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie' 1 (1877), pp. 337-356: "Noch einmal: Marie de Compiègne und das 'Évangile aux Femmes.'" See p. 341.

c. Printed by M. Leopold Constans, 'Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie' viii (1884), pp. 24-36: *L'Évangile aux Femmes*. See p. 36.

- 24 a. Printed by M. Constans (see note 23 c.), p. 36.

b. Printed by the writer, MOD. LANG. NOTES (see note 13).

25 Printed by Herr Gustav Binz, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* xiv (1890), pp. 172-174: "Zum Évangile aux Femmes." See p. 173.

26 Unpublished.

27 Unpublished.

#### IV. *La Vie de Saint Alexi*;

V. Anonymous poem on false love;  
and a similar expression in:

#### VI. Marcabrun, *L'Autrier*.

- I. *Bauduin de Sebourc*; vv. 631-636:<sup>28</sup>

"Belle," dist Brighedans, "ne soies esgaree.  
Je vous garirai bien, ains demain la journee,  
Car j'ai le medicine dont vous serez sanee."

"Sire," dist la pucelle, "nom avez: 'Foxibee';  
Venus estez trop tart, li heure est ja passee;  
Bien sai que vous aves fallit a le donnee."

- II. *Li Bastars de Buillon* (B. N. f. 12552, anc. suppl. franç. 205, fo157d), vv. 5125-5132:<sup>29</sup>

"Sire," dist li bastars, "par le Vierge honneree,

Corsabrans s'en reva pardevers sa contree,  
Mais de sa gent i a laisset grande maree;  
Sousprendre nous cuidoit a cheste matinee,  
Mais on le doit clamer par rayson: "Fousibee,"

Si convient que nostre os soit desormais gardee

- 28 a. Printed in: *Li Romans de Bauduin de Sebourc*, iiiie Roy de Jherusalem, publié pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale, par M. Bocca. Tome I, Valenciennes, 1841. 8vo, xiv and 384 pp. See p. 141.

b. Printed by Prof. Tobler (see note 6. c.)

c. Referred to in: *Brun de la Montaigne*, roman d'aventure publié pour la première fois, d'après le manuscrit unique de Paris par Paul Meyer. Paris, Didot, 1875. 8vo, xvi and 151 pp. (*Société des Anciens Textes Français*).

P. 143, under the rubric *Vocabulaire*, the following is given:

"Folz i bée 3749, fol y vise, locut. employée comme surnom; de m'me dans Baudouin de Sebourc, t. I, p. 141."

d. Referred to by Prof. Förster (see note 2. e).

e. Printed to by Prof. Scheler (see note 4. d), who gives the following note on p. 303, under the rubric *Notes et Rectifications*.

"5129 Fous-i-bée, phrase populaire pour désigner un sot déçu dans ses projets; cp. Baud. de Seb. I, 141 (v. 634):

Sire, dist la pucelle, nom avés fox i bée:

Venus estes trop tart, li heure est ja passée.

Cette phrase-substantif méritait une place dans l'ouvrage capital de M. Darmesteter sur la formation des mots composés, à côté de *fol-l'y-laisse*."

f. Printed by M. Godefroy (see note 4. f.)

- 29 a. Printed by M. Scheler (see note 4. d), p. 182.

b. Printed by Prof. Tobler (see note 4. d).

c. Printed by Prof. Tobler (see note 6. c).

d. Referred to by Prof. Förster (see note 2. e).

e. Printed by M. Godefroy (see note 4. f.)



Mieus qu'elle n'ait este et main et a vespree,  
Car, se Corsabrin poet, sa perte ert recouv-  
reee."

III. *Brun de la Montaigne*, (B. N. f. 2170, anc. 7989. 4, Baluze 646, f079v0), vv. 3747-3752 :30

Adont li dist : "De qui, haute dame honnoree?  
Onques ne fu m'amour vraiment demandee,  
Si que par ce point ci cilz a non : "Folzybee"  
Qui m'ainme et si n'en fu onques mercis rou-  
vee.

On ne doit pas donner chose qui n'est rouvee."

IV. *La Vie de Saint Alexi* (see No. A. vii).

V. Anonymous poem on false love, (Geneva 1796is, f070v0) :31

Et si, vous doit bien souvenir  
Des maulx qu'on a veu advenir  
A maint prince de renommee,  
Pour ce qu'ilz vouloient offrir  
Leur amour a ceulx qui souffrir  
Vouloient en mainte contree  
Leur contraire; faulse pensee  
Estoit en eulx; dont : "Folyvee"  
Puis bien ceulx nommer sans mentir  
Qui si ont leur amour donnee  
A ceulx qu'onques nulle journee  
N'orent vouloir de bien servir.

VI. (*Prov.*) Marcabrun, *L'Autrier* :32

'Senher, tan m'avetz lauzada,  
que tota 'nsui enojada,  
pos en pretz m'avetz levada,  
'per so n'auretz per soudada  
al partir "bada, fol, bada"  
e la muza meliana.'

#### C. FOLSIPREND.

I. *Foulque de Candie* :33

30 a. Printed by M. P. Meyer (see note 28. b), p. 129.

b. Printed by Prof. Förster (see note 2. e).

31 a. Printed in: *Bulletin de l'Institut Genevois*, Tome xxiii. (*Non vidimus*).

b. The same article also published separately as: *Poésies des xive et xve Siècles*, publiées d'après le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de Genève, par Eugène Ritter, Professeur à l'Université de Genève. Genève, Georg, 1880. 8vo, 72 pp. See pp. 31-32.

c. Printed by M. Godefroy (see note 4. f.)

32 a. Printed in: *Chrestomathie Provençale*, accompagnée d'une grammaire et d'un glossaire, par Karl Bartsch. Quatrième édition, revue et corrigée. Elberfeld, 1880. 8vo, 600 cols. See col. 53. (Troisième éd., 1875, col. 60).

b. Referred to by Prof. Tobler (see note 4. d.)

33 a. Printed in: *Le Roman de Foulque de Candie, par Herbert Leduc, de Dammartin*. (Publié par M. Prosper Tarbé) Reims, 1860. 8vo, lxix and 228 pp. P. lxxviii, under the rubric *Notice*, we find the following statements :

- a. Voit Folsiprend, a sa main l'acena :  
Ele li vint, et l'enfant l'embrassa :  
S'amor li quist, et ele li dona.  
Guichart fu liez qui moult l'en mercia.
- b. Et Faussete s'en voit sous son orel gabant  
Et dit a Folsiprent :—"Cocine, a vos me vent."

#### D. FOLLILAISSIE.

I. *Chasse de Gaston Phébus*, (anc. B. N. Maz. 514, f058b) :34

Puis levera le collier que aucuns appellent : *follilaisie*; c'est une char qui est demourée entre la hampe et les epaules, et vient tout entour par dessus l'os du long de la hampe sus le jargel.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

"Dans la suite d'Anfêlise est une jeune beauté nommée Folsiprend. Guichard :

Voit Folsiprend, à sa main l'acena :  
Ele li vint, et l'enfant l'embrassa :  
S'amor li quist, et ele li dona.

Guichart fu liez qui moult l'en mercia. . . .

Cela n'empêche pas le gaillard cavalier de faire plus tard un mariage de convenance, en épousant l'héritière d'un royaume."

On p. 78 the second portion of the text quoted is given, and p. 188, under the rubric *Notes sur les Noms d'Hommes*, we find the following notice :

*Folsiprend*.—Demoiselle de la suite d'Anfêlise.—Il faut lire son nom ainsi : Fol s'y prend.—Le fol qui s'prend d'elle est Guichard, l'étourdi de l'armée; mais il ne l'épouse pas.

b. Referred to by Prof. Tobler (see note 6. c).

34 a. Printed by M. La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, *Dictionnaire Historique de l'Ancien Langage François*, ou Glossaire de la Langue Française depuis son origine jusqu'au siècle de Louis XIV, publié par L. Favre, Niort : Paris, 1879. 4to, 444 pp. See vol. vi p. 252, s. v. follilaisie. We find there the following statements :

"*Follilaisie*. Partie de la viande qu'on lève le long des épaules du cerf : "Puis levera le collier que aucuns appellent *follilaisie*; c'est une char qui est demourée entre la hampe et les epaules, et vient tout entour par dessus l'os du long de la hampe sus le jargel." (*Chasse de Gaston Phébus*, Ms. page 193)."

b. Printed from the above by M. Littré (see note 2. b), s. v. follilaisie, with the following remarks :

"Terme de vénerie. La partie de viande qu'on lève le long des épaules du cerf. On trouve aussi follet et follet.  
—Étym. *Fol l'y laisse* (à cause de la délicatesse supérieure de cette chair)."

c. Printed by M. Godefroy (see note 4. f.) s. v. follilaisie, with the remark :

"(*Cast. Feb.*, Maz. 514, f058b) Var., follilaisie. (Ms. suivi par Ste-Palaye, p. 193.)"

### NOTE ON ELISION IN MODERN ITALIAN.

It is the purpose of this note to show the varying usage from two works respectively of two contemporary Italian writers in eliding, or in not eliding, the final vowel in the most important words for which elision is permissible but not required. While in spoken Italian elision is the rule in such cases, and in the written language is supported by no less authority than that of Petrocchi, there are many writers who prefer, in the vast majority of cases, to write the words in full. Among this class, for example, is the novelist, Anton G. Barrili. This writer has such an aversion to elisions in general that he sometimes fails to elide a vowel where classic usage demands it; as, for example, in the case of the *a* of the article *la* before a following vowel.

As an example of the writers who, on the contrary, nearly always elide the vowels where it is admissible, may be mentioned Edmondo de Amicis. In the following tables I give the results of an examination of the cases of elision and of non-elision in one work (the *Alberto* of de Amicis and *Una Notte Bizzarra* of Barrili) of each of the authors above mentioned. I have thought it necessary to tabulate the results only for those words in which elisions are most frequent though not required. For the sake of convenience I have treated the adverbs *vi*, *ci*, *ne* and the corresponding pronouns together, as their use as adverbs or as pronouns seems to have no effect on the elision or retention of the final vowel. The words studied are: *di*, the object pronouns *si*, *lo*, *la*, *mi*, *ti*, and the adverbs and pronouns *vi*, *ci*, *ne*.

Elision and non-elision in the *Alberto*.

	Before:		Before Other words be- ginning with:					No. of Elisions.	No. of Non-Elisions.	% of Elisions.
	Essere.	Avere.	un, una, uno.	a.	e.	i.	o.			
<i>di</i>	1	1	4	1	1		1	2	11	
<i>d'</i>	2	4	34	24	3	5	7	3	82	88
<i>si</i>	1			5				1	7	
<i>s'</i>	29			25		6			60	89
<i>lo</i>		3					2	1	17	3
<i>l'</i>		14								85
<i>la</i>									4	100
<i>l'</i>		3		1						
<i>mi</i>		1		2					3	
<i>m'</i>	1	4		6				1	13	83
<i>ti</i>										
<i>t'</i>	1	1							2	100
<i>vi</i>										
<i>v'</i>	5	2							7	100
<i>ci</i>		1							1	
<i>c'</i>	26								26	96
<i>ne</i>		5		1		2			8	
<i>n'</i>	4	2		5					11	60
Total No. of Elisions.	68	31	34	61	3	11	9	5	222	
Total No. of non-Elisions.		2	11	4	9	1	2	1	3	33
Per Cent of Elisions.	97	74	90	86	75	85	90	63		87

Elision and non-elision in *Una Notte Bizzarra*.

	Before:		Before Other words be- ginning with:					No. of Elisions.	No. of Non-Elisions.	% of Elisions.
	Essere.	Avere.	un(a).	a.	e.	i.	o.			
<i>di</i>		1	24	17	2		15	50		
<i>d'</i>	4	3	5	5	3	3	4	3	27	35
<i>si</i>				9	2	1			17	
<i>s'</i>	1			1	3	5	1		11	40
<i>lo</i>		9		4						13
<i>l'</i>		6					1		7	35
<i>la</i>		1								
<i>l'</i>	2	6		1					9	90
<i>mi</i>		9		5				1	15	
<i>m'</i>		6				2			8	35
<i>ti</i>		2				1	1			6
<i>t'</i>				1					1	14
<i>vi</i>	2	11		9						22
<i>v'</i>					1					
<i>ci</i>		11		10	1				1	22
<i>c'</i>	11			3					14	40
<i>ne</i>		4		8		1				13
<i>n'</i>	2							2		13
Total No. of Elisions.	20	18	5	8	10	10	6	3	80	
Total No. of Non-Elisions.		5	48	24	64	5	3	2	8	159
Per Cent of Elisions	80	29	17	12	67	77	75	27		33

### Points of Contrast.

1. By comparing these tables we discover that while Amicis elides in 222 cases out of the 255 observed or in 87 per cent of the whole number, Barrili elides in only 80 cases out of 239 or in less than 34 per cent of the whole number observed.

2. Only in the case of *ne* does the number of elisions with Amicis fall below 80 per cent, while with Barrili it is only in the case of *la* that the number of elisions exceeds 40 per cent.

3. Amicis *always* elides the *i* of *vi* before *essere* and *avere*; Barrili *never* does in the work studied.

4. In the work of Amicis we find the *i* of *di* most frequently elided before *un*, *una*, *uno*; in the novel of Barrili it is most rarely elided in such cases.

5. In *Alberto* the *i* of *si* is elided in 60 cases out of 67, while in *Una Notte Bizzarra* such elision takes place in only 11 cases out of 28.

6. Amicis elides the *o* of *lo* in 17 out of 20 cases, while Barrili elides it only 7 times out of 20.

7. With Amicis elisions in *mi*, *ti*, *vi*, *ci* are almost general, while with Barrili they occur in only about 25 per cent of the cases.

8. Elisions before other words than *essere* and *avere* are most common in *Alberto* before *a* and *u*, but in *Una Notte Bizzarra* they are least common before these vowels.

### Points of Resemblance.

1. Both authors regularly elide the final vowel in the words under consideration when the following word begins with a corresponding vowel; that is, they write *l'ho* for *lo ho*, *l'ha* for *la ha*, *s'intende* for *si intende*, etc.,. The *Alberto* offers only one exception to this rule and the other romance only three.

2. With both authors elisions are most common before *essere*, where they are of general occurrence and comprise more than 25 per cent of the whole number of elisions found in both romances.

3. The *a* of *la* is regularly elided in both works.

4. We find in both authors cases of elision before each of the vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, a fact which shows that while elision may be in-

fluenced by the character of the following vowel it is in no wise dependent on it.

5. Neither of the two authors elides the vowel of the pronouns *li* and *le*, and only rarely does either of them elide the *e* of *che*. When *che* is used as the subject of a sentence, even Amicis elides the *e* in only one or two cases in the whole work.

Although other permissible, but not required, elisions (besides those mentioned in the tables), are found, they are not apparently sufficiently common to authorize their general practice by the student of Italian; though he may practice elision for all the words to which I have called special attention. In view of the fact that elisions are so general in spoken Italian, and in the written language are supported by the highest authority, it would seem advisable for the learner to elide the vowels wherever permissible in the words to which I have referred as he will find it more natural to write *d'avere* than *di avere*, *l'ha* than *lo ha*, *m'aveva* than *mi aveva*, etc., since he is already accustomed probably to write in French: *d'avoir*, *l'a*, *m'avait*, etc.

J. CHARLES WALKER.

Johns Hopkins University.

### SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN.

*Wallenstein*. Ein dramatisches Gedicht von Schiller. With an introduction and notes by W. H. CARRUTH, Ph. D. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1894. 8vo, lxxix, 58, 130, 200, etc.

*Wallenstein*. Ein Trauerspiel von Friedrich Schiller. Edited (with introduction, English notes, and an appendix) by KARL BREUL, M. A., Ph. D. 1. Wallensteins Lager. Die Piccolomini. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1894. 8vo, lvi, 299.

IN MOD. LANG. NOTES of March 1892, Professor Brandt emphasized the need of editions of the complete *Faust* and of *Wallenstein*. Since then Professor Thomas has published his excellent edition of the First Part of *Faust*, promising us a similar edition of the Second Part, and during the past year we have received two editions of *Wallenstein*, while a third one, to be published by Messrs. Ginn &



Co., is in course of preparation. Some good editions of Lessing's *Nathan* have been accessible for some time, and thus our American colleges will soon be able to study to full advantage these three masterpieces of German dramatic art, which are also the greatest works of the three foremost figures in German literature.

Of the two new editions of *Wallenstein*, the one by Dr. Breul is as yet incomplete. The second volume has not been published up to the time of this writing and, for that reason, a detailed review of the work is postponed for the present. The first volume before us contains a general introduction (pp. xi-lvi), the text of the *Lager* and *Die Piccolomini*, the notes on these (pp. 169-289), an appendix, and two very useful indexes to the notes. The introduction is composed of a brief life of Schiller (pp. xi-xx), a discussion of the metre (pp. xx-xl), an account of the genesis of the drama (pp. xl-xlvi), and the inevitable 'argument' (pp. xlvii-lvi). There is no historical introduction, and from the wording of the preface it remains doubtful whether or not the second volume will remove this serious omission. The text is excellently printed and practically free from all typographical errors. The notes, extending over two hundred pages of fine print, exhibit all the strong and weak points of the editor's well-known manner, and will be of interest and value to most teachers. The whole book is a worthy match for the previous excellent editions which Dr. Breul has prepared for the Pitt Press Series, and though we may differ from the editor with regard to what constitutes the most desirable edition of a classic German drama, we must admit that his work is always refreshing for its precision, scholarliness and conscientious accuracy. The editor has evidently spared neither time nor labor to do well that which he considers best to do.

The other edition of *Wallenstein*, which lies complete before us in an attractive volume of a little over five hundred pages, is in many respects very different from Dr. Breul's book.

The Introduction (pp. iii-lxxxi) contains no account of the poet's life, which seems entirely proper with a play like *Wallenstein*. There are only a few remarks on the metre, while its

*pièce de résistance* is a very readable chapter of some fifty pages that gives everything "needful for the historical orientation of the student." Besides, there is a chapter on the genesis and one on the significance of the drama, and an alphabetic list of persons. Both the Introduction and the preceding 'Biographical Suggestions' seem to indicate that the editor has been especially interested in the historical bearings of the drama. It cannot be denied, though, that he has yielded too exclusively to this personal preference, while he has not used to full advantage the various literary commentaries and editions. In his Biographical Suggestions he mentions nine historical works—all in German except one—but no other commentaries than that of Düntzer, and no other editions except those with English notes by Buchheim, Cotterill, and Hart. This seems out of all proportion, since *Wallenstein* is above all a work of art for the full comprehension of which it is not necessary to go deeply into the details of historical research. Some of the best commentaries on the drama as such would be of far greater value to the teacher for whom the "Biographical Suggestions" evidently are intended. If he is recommended to study Murr, Herchenhahn, Gädecke and other historical writers, his attention should still more be called to editions like those of Vollmer or Funke, and to commentaries like those of Bellermann, Werder and others. Also the exclusive mention of Palleske and Boyesen as biographers of Schiller must cause some astonishment. For if these Biographical Suggestions are to contain only a few books, which seems very commendable, it is so much the more the editor's duty carefully to select the most important and most useful works. Also in other respects these suggestions do not make an impression of care and accuracy. Of Buchheim's book a sixth edition appeared in 1884; of Ranke's work a fourth edition in 1880.

The historical introduction contains the following chapters: i. The Thirty Years' War. ii. The Catastrophe. iii. *Wallenstein*. iv. Identification of Characters. This is the most valuable part of the book and it will doubtless well serve its purpose. On p. vii the wording of "the Calvinists, called the 'Re-

formed 'faith' needs to be changed. On p. xiii "Capo d'Armada" should be explained. On p. xvii the student will probably not know what is meant by the "Mantuan succession." On p. xxvi it is not clear how Bernhard in the fall of 1633 by a movement "toward the north-east" could "enter the gap" between Wallenstein's army "in Lusatia" and that of Alt-ringer "in the extreme southwestern part of Germany." Bernhard, at that time, was near Ingolstadt and, consequently, was already between the two Imperial armies. He had "entered the gap" in the spring of that year by a movement southward from Würzburg towards Donauwörth. On pp. xxi and xxiv the statements with reference to the command of the army of the League should be more explicit, as on the whole the important relations between Wallenstein and the League on the one hand, and between the League and the Emperor on the other, might have been set forth more clearly. On p. 1 it is difficult to see how it can be said of Schiller's Wallenstein that "he confesses and is penitent." Misprints in this part of the book occur on p. iii, 20 (read: drama), on p. xxix, 9 (read: materials), on p. xl, 18 (read: glaubwürdigen), on p. lii, 6 (read: Gallas).

The fifth chapter of the introduction deals with the genesis of the drama and, while satisfactory on the whole, it contains various signs of lack of carefulness. *Fiesco* appeared in 1783, not 1784. On p. lv we find the title *Die Geschichte des niederländischen Abfalls*. Work on *Die Neue Thalia* could not influence Schiller in 1794, since the publication had been discontinued in 1793. *Maria Stuart* appeared in 1801, not 1800; *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* in 1802, not 1801.

In the brief sixth chapter on The Significance of the Drama the "tragical motive in Wallenstein" is too exclusively discussed.

In the seventh chapter the metre is briefly discussed. The few statements on the blankverse seem quite sufficient, because the student of *Wallenstein* will probably not read German blankverse for the first time. The sixteen lines on the *Knittelverse* of the *Lager*, however, can hardly suffice to give the student a correct idea of this irregular metre which he has probably never met before. At least

a few practical remarks about the reading of the verses would be desirable.

The alphabetic List of Persons is certainly welcome for reference in a play abounding in historical characters. In most instances it is, however, quite superfluous to enumerate by act and scene or page and line how often a person appears in the play or is in any manner referred to. Moreover, none but historical persons should be given in the list; the reason for mentioning the *Gefreiter*, the *Kammerfrau* and others is somewhat puzzling. There are some inconsistencies in the spelling of names; the list gives only *Dubald* (*Duwall*), *Liechtenstein*, *Palffy*, while the text has *Dübold*, *Lichtenstein*, *Palffy*. *Rheingraf* is in the wrong place alphabetically. *Pyrrhus* and *Attila* are mentioned; if so, why not *Ahab* and *Jerobeam*? Omitted are also *Charles of Bourbon* and *Charles V.* Much to be regretted is the exclusion of names of places. The list would be much more useful if it were a general list of proper names. By omitting from the list what is unnecessary, the names of places could be added without requiring any additional space. Words like *Saal*, *Halberstadt*, *Olmütz*, *Burgau* and many others which are not explained in the notes, will be troublesome to the student who will not know whether he can find them on the map or not.

The Text is far from being satisfactory, and it seems that both the editor and the publishers are to be held responsible for this fact. Old and worn plates have been used; as a consequence, letters and punctuation, especially at the beginnings and ends of lines, are often illegible or even invisible. Besides, there is a large number of typographical errors which should have been carefully corrected even if old plates were used. The very least we are entitled to expect of a school edition of a classic is a fairly correct text. It is also a grave drawback to the class use of the book that the lines of the text are not numbered, while the reference in the notes are necessarily to page and line. It would require too much space to give an approximately complete list of the misprints noticed in the use of the book. Only the following shall be mentioned. PROLOG: 4, 23 *die* should be spaced; 4, 27



read *mächtig*; 7, 16 *er* should be spaced. LAGER: 35, 8 read *Eisenschmelter*; 37, 10 read *Spitzbub*; 55, 15 read *Sprecher*; 57, 21 read *schier?*.—PICCOLOMINI: 8, 11 read *Dass*; 55, 2 read *Ihren* (cf. 50, 14); 89, 9 read *der*; 121, 17 read *wissen?*; 126, 9 read *viel?*.—TOD: 33, 1 read *auf- und abgegangen* (cf. pp. 10 and 58); 65, 9 read *mündig* (else there should be a note); 77, 6 read *Was!*; 98, 1 read *glauben's*; 124, 14 read *Sie*; 131, 9 read *gekommen*; 140, 20 read *Säh'*; 145, 2 read *Er*; 157, 14 read *Ihrer*; 178, 19 read *dass*.—In the note on Picc. 7, 19 read *Greif zu*; in the note on Picc. 126, 12 read *nacher*; in the note on Tod 58, 3 read 196, ll. 3-5; in the note on Tod 67, 10 read 19; in the note on Tod 83 insert 12 before *abschicken*; in the note on Tod 124, 14 read *Laren*; in the note on Tod 137, 1 read 1633-34; in the note on Tod 165, 5 read *der*.

The punctuation throughout the text is especially faulty. The orthography is avowedly modernized (even *Kriegsfuri* in Lager 31, 15 is changed to *Kriegsfurie*), and yet we find forms like *wächst* with round *s*, *läugnen*, *ächt*, *ärnten* and others that must necessarily be confusing to the student. There is also repeated inconsistency in the use of C and K in words like *Kürassier*, *Kornet*, *Kourier* and others. In this connection it may be mentioned that it seems very desirable that in our editions of classic texts there should be uniformity with reference to the use of capitals in *er* and *ihr* when used as pronouns of address of the second person singular. Prof. Carruth prints *Er* and *ihr*; Dr. Breul *er* and *Ihr*; Professor Buchheim *Er* and *Ihr*; the Cotta editions and, probably, Schiller himself, *er* and *ihr*. Thus we have all possible variety, which is at times quite confusing. It would seem that if we change at all, none but practical consideration should guide us in this matter and that on that account it would be most desirable to follow Professor Buchheim's example and write *Er* (to distinguish it from the third pers. sing.) and *Ihr* (to distinguish it from the second person plural).

The Notes on the entire drama fill forty-seven pages, and it is evident that it has been the commendable desire of the editor to restrict the notes so as not to make the whole book inconveniently large. The question is

only whether he has not gone too far in what is, on the whole, the right direction. It would seem that Dr. Breul, in his edition, has often been too prolix in his notes. Prof. Carruth, to my mind, has no less often been too brief, or has omitted altogether to call attention to those unusual or irregular forms and constructions which in *Wallenstein*, and especially in the *Lager*, are more frequent than in the others of Schiller's dramas that are generally read in our colleges. And yet there was no need for such excessive limitation, since the whole volume contains about five hundred pages, so that some twenty or thirty additional pages of notes would not have materially affected the size and cost of the book, while they would have greatly enhanced its value as a college text-book. The following expressions, for example, required a note, or at least a fuller note than they received: *thät* in Lager 10, 16 (the note does not explain the form); *für* in Lager 10, 13, etc.; *bass* in Lager 29, 17; *Zwiebel* as a masc. in Lager 32, 32; *selbst* in Lager 48, 4; *also* in Lager 51, 25; *schwürig* in Picc. 19, 12 (Breul prints *schwierig*; but even then the meaning is not 'difficult of approach', but 'in Gährung,' cf. Sanders s. v. *schwierig*); *Wissenschaft* in Picc. 20, 1; *eilf* in Picc. 32, 5; *Böheim* in Picc. 51, 2; *sonsten* in Picc. 60, 12; *weil* in Picc. 66, 8; *ob* in Picc. 70, 21; *auf* in Picc. 99, 11; *stündest* in Picc. 119, 17; *darfst* (=bedarfst) in Tod 76, 4; *die hohlen Läger* in Tod 94, 17. A great many more instances could be quoted, but these will suffice to justify our criticism. To let such forms and constructions pass unnoticed is unpedagogic, in as far as it will necessarily produce carelessness on the part of the student who is led to believe that an additional ending or some other change of form or word cuts no figure and is not worthy of his careful observation. Besides, the general character of Prof. Carruth's annotation clearly shows that he has not written his edition for very advanced students, who could possibly be supposed to be familiar with most of such archaic or unusual forms.

Again, there are quite a number of other instances where brief notes seem necessary to explain the thought of the passage. No doubt in such cases different annotators will always differ concerning the extent of required anno-



tation. Yet the shade of thought expressed in a passage often causes more difficulty to the student than the forms or constructions involved, and to my mind it is to be regretted that both Prof. Carruth and Dr. Breul have almost entirely confined themselves to notes on grammatical and historical points. The thought, bearing, force, and artistic value of certain passages or whole scenes should at least occasionally be explained and impressed upon our students. A literary masterpiece like *Wallenstein* seems imperatively to demand such treatment. To leave this part of the interpretation entirely to the teacher is certainly not always the wisest thing the editor can do, if he is interested in insuring a full appreciation of the work he edits. As specimens of passages that for some such reason seem to require fuller interpretation than they have received at the hands of Prof. Carruth, we may mention: PROLOG 7, 11-12; 8, 14-16; LAGER 37, 1; PICC. 24, 1; 28, 25; 40, 13; 77, 9; 90, 7-12; 107, 5; TOD 33, 7; 39, 18-20. On the other hand, in a few instances, as in LAGER 35, 8, the notes given contain unnecessary details, although we admit that such is very rarely the case.

We also find that the commendable desire of being brief has repeatedly induced the editor merely to give a translation where the difficulty involved should be, however briefly, explained; cf., for example, PICC. 32, 16 (the translation given will induce the student to mistake *bei* for English 'by' with the passive); 100, 26; 102, 4.

Some of the notes that are common to both editions are interesting inasmuch as they represent differences of opinion. PROLOG 4, 7 Prof. Carruth, following Düntzer, refers the much discussed *Kreis* to the auditorium, while Dr. Breul less acceptably interprets it as 'circle of spectators.' In either case, however, *Bühne* is not in apposition to *Kreis* and the comma after *Bühne* should be omitted.—PROLOG 8, 4 Prof. Carruth refers *den ungewöhnlichen Tönen* to the use of the metre, Dr. Breul to the subject of the play. Dr. Breul's interpretation is new, but he supports it not unsuccessfully.—PROLOG 8, 15 Prof. Carruth explains *ihren Schein* as referring to *Täuschung*, while Dr. Breul seems to give to *Schein* the mean-

ing of 'ästhetischer Schein,' referring *ihren* grammatically to *Muse* or *Kunst*.

A few more instances of difference of opinion will be mentioned in the following comments on some of Prof. Carruth's notes. PICC. 14, 6. *Schafe* does not refer to the courtiers, but to the citizens in general, particularly to the Bohemians.—PICC. 22, 9. It is difficult to take the proposed historical parallel seriously. The editor himself cannot tell us who is meant by Octavius, and we can surely not consider Questenberg unpolitic enough to suggest to Max the rôle of Brutus. The epithets *heilbringend* and *vorbedeutungsvoll* very naturally refer to the fame and renown attaching to the names of the two men themselves.—PICC. 51, 29. The translation gives to the line a cruel meaning which is almost the opposite of what it really expresses. Dr. Breul's interpretation is correct and his quotation from 'Der Taucher' very appropriate.—PICC. 52, 9. *Ruhm* seems to refer to Gustavus' reputation of being invincible (cf. 51, 9), although as a matter of fact he was not really defeated at Nuremberg.—PICC. 57, 3. This note should be on 33, 13.—PICC. 78, 15. *Gitschin* can surely not be called "a large city."—PICC. 91, 9. *Ich gebe* cannot be understood; rather *Es lebe*.—PICC. 102, 9. This note should be on 99, 11 with a reference to Lager 28, 13.—PICC. 110, 6. The note, though not wrong, is misleading, since the uncontracted form has nothing to do with the causative meaning of the verb.—PICC. 112, 7. This *e* is generally ascribed to the influence of the weak verbs; see Paul, 2. ed., p. 61 and Weinhold, 2. ed., p. 399.—PICC. 121, 10-13. The passage would lose much of its force if we referred *Schritt* to *Rache*. Wallenstein's own act must cause his perdition; cf. Bellermann ii, 160.—TOD 22, 10. This note should be on 20, 6.—TOD 23, 1. If anything were to be supplied, it would be *da*; but *nun* itself is used as a causal conjunction. The proposed insertion of *dass* would entirely destroy the sense of the line.—TOD 28, 21. A note should call attention to the "technical" meaning of *neuen Menschen*=homines novi.—TOD 28, 23. *Aufwand* is not 'prodigality,' but 'effort,' 'exertion;' *mit gleichem Aufwand*='equally easily.'—TOD 31, 1. *Dies Geschlecht* does not mean 'present humanity,' but

'this race (of ours),' i. e. mankind in general.—TOD 57, 9. *Sie macht die Kränkung gut* does not seem to me "auffallend" as Düntzer calls it, whom Prof. Carruth follows. Octavio says that the Emperor does not only forgive Buttler's intended desertion (p. 53), but even "makes good the wrong" previously done Buttler. For by confirming his appointment as Major General, the Emperor confers upon Buttler an honor similar to the one refused before.—TOD 63, 1. There is not so much of a "sudden change of tone" as Prof. Carruth seems to think, especially if we take *deiner=des Namens, den du führst* (p. 62, 11).—TOD 78, 13. *Entdeckt's* is evidently a mistake for *Entdeck's* since the countess invariably addresses Wallenstein with *du*. Kurz, Birlinger, and Buchheim print *Entdeck's*.—TOD 79, 6. The proposed change of reading "which seems inevitable" to the editor, is as arbitrary as unnecessary. The line as Schiller wrote it is beyond reproach, since in the context it cannot possibly be misconstrued. No wonder that "all texts have" the unchanged reading.—TOD 84, 26. Again the proposed change is uncalled for. Instead of improving the passage it detracts materially from its force. The poet very happily implies that the *Gedankenlosen* have no *Busen*, that is "no heart" (l. 23): *Nichts fällt (bei den Gedankenlosen) in eines Busens stillen Grund (wie es wohl bei tieferfühlenden Naturen der Fall ist)*.—TOD 144, 15. It cannot be denied that the line is troublesome; but Prof. Carruth's interpretation is not convincing. The comparison between Wallenstein and Archimedes may be far-fetched and the parallel but faint. But a comparison between Wallenstein and Max is still less plausible since the causes leading to their respective deaths are entirely different. Prof. Carruth's chief objection is to *jener dort*. But could *dort* not be taken to modify the following in *seinem Zirkel*, the *seinem* referring to *jener*, not to *er* (Wallenstein)? 'He will fall like that other one (who fell) yonder in the midst of his circles.'—TOD 166, 10. According to Düntzer and others *krumm* does not mean 'sway-backed' but 'spavined.'—TOD 174, 7. *Gut* modifying *Glück* was not "unusual" in Schiller's time, in fact is not so now; cf. *auf gut Glück*. See Sanders s.v. *Glück*.

The edition contains a good map, a facsimile of the 'revers,' and a few well-executed historical portraits, all of which additions are well-adapted to stimulate interest in the drama and its historical background.

On the whole, however, the entire book shows too much the lack of a finishing hand, of a careful final redaction. Traces of hasty work are too frequent, even for a first edition. If, as we learn, a second edition may be published before long, we have a right to expect at least a correct text with lines numbered, while we hope for a carefully revised and somewhat more liberal body of notes. As the book is now, notwithstanding its various good features, which we cheerfully acknowledge, it cannot be called an adequate edition of one of the greatest masterpieces of German literature, and we still have reason to look forward with expectation to the edition of *Wallenstein* announced by Messrs. Ginn & Co.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Goethe* von RICHARD M. MEYER, Preisgekrönte Arbeit. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co., 8vo, pp. 600, 1895.

THE publishing house of Hofmann & Co. offered July 15, 1891, a prize of three thousand marks for the best Goethe biography, and this prize was awarded Oct. 1, 1893, to Dr. Richard M. Meyer, Privatdozent in the University of Berlin. The work is a book of about 600 octavo pages, well printed and aims to treat chronologically Goethe's life and works. In view of the enormous critical and biographical work which is being done in Germany on Goethe, it is highly desirable that a biography should appear from time to time which should present to the public Goethe the man and the poet in the light of the most accurate thought of the period. Such is evidently Dr. Meyer's intention. He aims to popularize the most fruitful investigations which have appeared on Goethe in recent years and thus to correct the many false views and impressions of the poet current in Germany. The author complains that Goethe is not sufficiently read in Germany and hopes



by his book to stimulate the public to a more intelligent, critical study of the national poet.

The book is singularly free from those long quotations which makes Düntzer's biography such dreary and unprofitable reading. Dr. Meyer is not satisfied with the mere accurate statement of facts, but aims throughout at the interpretation of the poet. He is thoroughly acquainted with the best critical material on Goethe, states the gist of the various critical views clearly and definitely, and generally takes a very sound attitude toward them. The only serious criticism that can be urged against the book is that it will hardly fulfill the purpose for which it was written. It is clearly intended for the general reader whose knowledge of Goethe is slight or superficial. But Dr. Meyer is so fully imbued with his subject and is so strongly conscious of the many questions, sometimes of a technical nature, that have been raised in connection with the character and works of Goethe, that he but too often addresses himself to the scholarly world rather than to the general public, for whom these problems have little or no interest. It seems to us, for instance, that it is hardly in place in a book of this sort to devote so much space to the many critical questions which are involved in the composition of *Faust*. The author proceeds here chronologically, takes issue with the various commentators of the drama and introduces much material which is apt to perplex the uninitiated reader rather than give him that stimulus for the critical study of the poet which is the avowed aim of the book. The same thing is true of most of the chapters of the book. The author wishes to discuss or at least touch upon almost every work of Goethe, and the chief criticisms made upon it. This overburdens the book with many names and titles which can be of little or no help to the general reader and will likely discourage many. A popular biography cannot, in the very nature of things, be complete and the insertion of titles and biographical details cannot make it so. A judicious sifting of the material and a strong emphasis upon the characteristic biographical and literary facts are essential to such a work. Herman Grimm, whose book on Goethe has done perhaps

more than any other work for the intelligent, general appreciation of the poet's genius and character, said some two years ago in one of his lectures, that if he were to rewrite his book, he would probably reduce it considerably, that the book although economically constructed, still contained much material that overburdened it and was of no importance to the general understanding of Goethe. Such self-denial Dr. Meyer has not shown in his biography. As it is, we doubt whether the book can do as much for the beginner as Grimm's work and for the closer study of Goethe, Dr. Meyer's biography is insufficient.

There are, however, several chapters in the book which, on account of their clearness of statement and excellence of judgment, deserve to be read for their own sake. Among these we class the chapters on Schiller and Goethe and on Goethe's scientific studies. In comparing Goethe's genius with that of Schiller, the author rejects the current idea that Goethe was the great realist and Schiller the idealist. If the difference between them had been as great as some critics have stated it, no permanent union would have been possible. Every true poet, the author justly urges, must be both an idealist and a realist. Goethe and Schiller are both close observers of nature, both work inductively, but with Schiller this process of induction is much more rapid than with Goethe. Almost simultaneously with the particular object observed, Schiller sees the general, and it is due to this sudden induction that Schiller's creations are less life-like than Goethe's.

The chapter on Goethe's scientific ideas and methods, is the clearest popular presentation of this difficult subject of which we know. Dr. Meyer shows that the strength and weakness of Goethe's scientific studies spring from his peculiar poetic nature. In developing this thought, the author gives us an excellent description of the most striking elements of Goethe's genius.

The style of the book is clear, falling perhaps too often into eulogizing periods. The reflections of the author are in many places so suggestive that the student of Goethe



will find himself amply repaid by reading the book.

MAX WINKLER.

*University of Michigan.*

### PROVENÇAL LITERATURE.

*Ueber die provenzalischen Feliber und ihre Vorgänger.* Rede bei der Uebnahme des Rektorats gehalten in der Aula der Universität Greifswald am 11. Mai, 1894, von EDUARD KOSCHWITZ. 48 pp. Berlin: 1894. Gronau.

THE year 1894 was noteworthy for the New Provençal literature; the publication by professor Koschwitz of his *Grammaire des Félibres* marks, as M. Lintilhac has well said, the close of the heroic period. During the past twelve months there has also been a deepening of interest in the literary movement in southern France; there have appeared in the magazines from the pens of various writers, articles that indicate a growing appreciation of the scope and success of this movement. The most important contributions to the study of the subject are the address of Professor Koschwitz, and two articles on Mistral by M. Gaston Paris, which appeared in the *Revue de Paris*.\* Of the latter we need say here only that they are written in the delightful style and from the scholarly point of view usual to their author.

Dr. Koschwitz' address gives a rapid survey of the literature of southern France from the Troubadours to the Félibres. After the decline of the Troubadours, which quickly followed that of the courts which had furnished their patrons, the southern country soon ceased to have an independent common literary language; those few writers who did not use the French language, wrote each in his local dialect and hence, with the exception of a handful of the most noted, they had a small circle of readers and a limited reputation. In spite of this, the poetic spirit continued, and each generation, up to our own, had its poets, some of them of fair literary merit. During the first half of the present century a marked increase in the number of poets showed itself in Provence, Jasmin especially winning a high place in the esteem of all France. There also arose num-

\*Oct. 1 and Nov. 15, 1894.

erous local associations of poets and lovers of poetry, but the decisive starting point in the history of the modern movement in Provençal literature was the organization in 1854 by Mistral, Roumanille, Aubanel and several others, of the *Félibrige*, or society of the *Félibres*, the aim of which was to unite the lovers of Provence and to revive its ancient glory. The success of the movement thus inaugurated has been one of the wonders of our century. Soon after the formation of the new association, followed (1859) Mistral's masterpiece, *Mireille*, the reception of which was as enthusiastic at Paris as at Avignon. Since Mistral and Roumanille were both from the district of St. Remi, on the east bank of the Rhone, and in view of the influence of Roumanille as the precursor of the *Félibrige* and of Mistral as the most successful and important of its members, it resulted that the dialect in which they wrote, the everyday speech of their home, was in its essential features adopted by the *Félibres*, and Provence had once more a literary language.

From these beginnings the Provençal renaissance has made increasing and rapid progress. New poets of solid worth have arisen; new members have flocked to the *Félibrige*, and it has become in a measure the "Académie provençale"; its aims and labors include the scientific study of the language and out of it has sprung the *Revue des Langues Romanes*; it has grown until its branches have had to be divided into four provinces, embracing all southern France and Catalonia. The poetry of the *Félibres* has long since won such a standing that it can no more be classed as dialect literature, and the speech of Saint-Remi is becoming to the Provençal what the Tuscan is to the Italian. Mistral has the joy of living to see the triumph of the movement, to the success of which he has contributed so much.

Koschwitz has handled his subject with great clearness and conciseness; in one respect his treatment constitutes a valuable addition to literary criticism in this field: he establishes clearly the historical continuity of the Provençal literature and the close relation of the poetry of the early part of the century to that of the *Félibres*; at the same time he

distinguishes the new elements introduced by them on account of which we rightly date the revival from the formation of the association—the *Félibrige* constitutes the first organized effort toward the literary reunion of Provence. All other writers who have done the *Félibres* justice have been too much inclined in their enthusiasm over the movement, to consider the *Félibrige* as a “spontaneous generation.”

The pamphlet before us is one of those accurate summaries of literary facts and tendencies so valuable to have at hand; students will find it helpful both at the beginning and at the close of a detailed study of the New Provençal literature, while the general reader who wishes a concise view of the literary situation as it is to-day in southern France will find it at once the newest and most valuable résumé of the subject.

It may be mentioned that Professor Koschwitz has paid a tribute to the value of Restori's little manual, *Letteratura Provenzale*, by using it as the basis of his treatment of the period from the close of the fifteenth century to Jasmin.

E. C. ARMSTRONG.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### CHAUCEER.

*Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, edited with an introduction, by ALFRED W. POLLARD. London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1894. 2 vols.

OF a man who had written a *Chaucer Primer* and tried his hand once before at editing the *Canterbury Tales* one would naturally expect no ordinary work. The editor's former edition (Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co., 1886), though printed with small type, was in exquisite form, and similar good taste is displayed in the present edition; in fact, most readers will prefer the open face of its type and care less that the paper is not so superfine.

The editor began his studies early enough to be able to speak in 1886 of the days of his “first Chaucer enthusiasm” as a thing of long ago. He felt himself ready to edit the poet, and issued the edition referred to. It consists of a text with a brief glossary and an introduction in which was given the usual

information as to the poet's life and works. What idea Mr. Pollard then had as to the duty of an editor may be seen from his statement of the “principle” on which he “constructed” his text:

“By taking the easiest readings from seven good manuscripts (the Harleian and those of the Six-Text edition), a large concession has been made to modern laziness, while the editor can still console himself that not one letter has been altered at his own discretion, or without manuscript authority.”

Between 1886 and 1894 his ideas have improved somewhat: he follows the Ellesmere MS. with moderate deviations, and recognizing that a brief glossary is not sufficient to enable a modern to read Chaucer understandingly, he has added notes. These are fair: they have the advantage of avoiding the elaborateness of Skeat's, but they are occasionally too scanty, and were evidently written in a genial holiday spirit. That is, they are not the result of a conscientious desire to find out the truth and explain all the real difficulties, but embody such information as the editor happened to possess or found easy at hand, while many difficulties are passed over unnoticed. We may draw a few examples from the first lines of the *Prologue*. The *ther as* in 34 does not attract the editor's attention, but from 172 on he regularly translates it ‘where that,’ while *thilke* is rendered ‘that same.’ He deems it necessary to warn the reader not to drop the *-e* of *nekke* in so easy a line as

His nekke whit was as the flour-de-lys,

But leaves him to struggle alone with such lines as

Gif me the victorie, I aske thee na more.

We are told (18) that “In Chaucer, as in French verse, words spelt alike but of different meaning are accepted as rhymes.” Why limit the statement to French verse? A reference to Sweet's *Primer* would have prevented the translation of

A Monk ther was a fair for the maistrice

by “one likely to be master.” How is the uninformed reader supposed to understand line 107? Though the passage in the *Roman de la Rose* cited by Tyrwhitt probably suggested the account of the table manners of



the Nonne, the lines—

Hire over-lippe wyped she so clene,  
That in hir coppe ther was no ferthyng sene  
Of grece, whan she dronken hadde hir draughte

find a better echo in Hans Sachs'

Vand wisch den mundt ehe du wilt trincken  
Das du nit schmalzig machst den wein

than in any of the usual references. Under  
193-4

I seigh his sleeves ypurfild at the hond  
With grys, and that the fyneste of a lond

reference might be made to *Piers Plowman*  
ii. 9:—

Purfild with pelure þe finest upon erthe.

The elaborate record of variant readings are said to be given "for the sake of the curious in such matters," but it would appear that they are a part of the preparation for the library edition that the editor first planned but fortunately abandoned in favor of the better equipped Professor Skeat.

It is evident that Mr. Pollard reads Chaucer with the pronunciation of Tennyson, except where meter or rime demand some consideration of the poet's own speech; what a delightful form of English this process must evolve. He would have preferred to print Chaucer entirely in modern spelling, for he

"feels strongly that, at least for the present generation, if Chaucer is to win the popularity which is his due, it must be by his being read as any other poet is read, and not as a text-book for students of Middle English."

And then follows a sling at such phonetic texts as Sweet's, which "make a mountain of a mole hill for the pleasure of afterwards paring it away." There will always be lazy people who are glad to have such excuses made for them. They read Goethe in much the same way and do get more or less out of the process. But does it matter much whether or not Chaucer and Goethe are popular among such people? The truth is that it does not take a great effort to acquire a fair Middle-English pronunciation, and, with the books now available, most teachers find little difficulty in teaching it in the first half-dozen lessons.

There is no indication that the editor realizes the dignity and importance of his undertaking or possesses any other preparation

for his task than was furnished by the everyday dilettante acquaintance with current Chaucer literature. He is even less in earnest than he was in 1886 and has gotten tired of much of the subject. He sums up the poet's life in "seventy words" and flippantly adds,

"The old lies about Chaucer's life and the poems absurdly attributed to him have been nailed to the counter again and again, and it ought not to be necessary to serve up the same stale dish every time we reprint his works."

He will not bother with such things but "proposes to embark on the pleasant little task" of "discussing one or two aspects of Chaucer's development as a literary artist."

The edition is a good one for those whom the editor apparently had in mind: persons of literary tastes who want to know something about Chaucer without bothering to find out just what he said and how he said it.

GEORGE HEMPL.

University of Michigan.

#### FRENCH LANGUAGE.

*Preparatory French Reader.* With Notes and Vocabulary. By GEORGE W. ROLLINS, master in the Public Latin School, Boston. 8vo, pp. 241, 67. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1894.

MR. ROLLINS' object is to "furnish interesting matter for first readings in French." He gives us no clue as to his position on the present vexed question as to when these "first readings" should best begin, and without this knowledge it is somewhat difficult to judge of the fitness of the selections. If reading is to begin with a month's introduction (or less), as many of our best educators now advocate, the first selection (Ortoli's *Compère Bouc et Compère Lapin*) seems a little too difficult. For example, there are four cases of the so-called "historical" infinitive on the first page of this piece. As this construction still awaits its reasonable explanation, it would seem best not to puzzle beginners with it at the outset.

Nearly one-third of the book is occupied by an abridgment of the oft-printed *Voyage de M. Perrichon*; the remaining two-thirds include two animal tales of Ortoli; two brief



contes of Lemaître; five historical pieces on the period of Louis XVI; two fables of La Fontaine, about a dozen other short poems, etc.

Töpffer's *Lac de Gers* (from the *Nouvelles Genevoises*) is presented, but with a great many omissions, of which the reader is nowhere advised. The celebrated *Chanson de la Palisse* is also included (p. 106), but no hint is given of its composite authorship, nor even of its humorous intent. Without this information the piece inevitably will appear ridiculous to beginners and to uninformed teachers. The contention by "M. de la Palisse" *qu'une jument Est toujours une cavale*, I should prefer to render: 'A horse is always a steed,' in place of 'a pad is always a horse' (p. 225), as the former retains the poetic coloring of the word *cavale* and avoids the obsolete word *pad*.

In general, the selections are very suitable for early readings. Notes, vocabulary and the table of irregular verbs have been prepared with evident care. A few inaccuracies should be noted:

The note (p. 209) on the adj. *décadent* is very lame; we fear the editor has missed the full force of Lemaître's witticism. *Oùt* (p. 213) is not "an old word for *moisson*," as stated, but an approach to a phonetic spelling of *Août*. The derived meaning in La Fontaine is too obvious to need explanation. *Dites voir* (p. 224) should not be translated "Let's see!" as *voir* is Latin *VERE*, and the expression is equivalent to *Dites donc*. Translate rather "Say!" This adverb (*veir, voir*) is common enough in Old French, and apparently has survived in the folk-speech of French Switzerland and Savoy.

*Par* in the expression *de par l'autorité* (p. 99), has nothing to do with the preposition *par* (Vocabulary, p. 37). It is strange that this time-honored misconception should thus persist after so many corrections. One must regret the tendency to slang in the translations: "talking big" for *faire des phrases* (p. 226); "come off!" for *allons donc* (p. 229), and one or two other instances.

Errors in printing noticed: *querir* for *quérir* (p. 101); wrong heading to p. 105 (*Pallisse* for *Palisse*, pp. 107, 109); *citronille* for *citrouille*

(p. 11 of Vocabulary). These are hardly worth noting, and this comparative freedom from typographical errors is praiseworthy.

THOMAS ATKINSON JENKINS.  
*Gwynedd, Penna.*

#### SPANISH PUBLICATIONS.

1. *El Pájaro Verde* by JUAN VALERA, Revised and Annotated for the use of English students by JULIO ROJAS. New York: W. R. Jenkins. 12mo, pp. 83.
2. *Partir á tiempo*, Comedia en un acto por DON MARIANO JOSÉ DE LARRA. Edited and annotated by ALEXANDER W. HERDLER. New York: W. R. Jenkins. 12mo, pp. 51.
3. *El Final de Norma*, por PEDRO A. DE ALARCÓN de la Real Academia Española. Arreglada y anotada en Inglés por R. D. DE LA CORTINA. New York: W. R. Jenkins. 12mo, pp. 297.
4. *El Desdén con el Desdén*, Comedia en tres jornadas por DON AGUSTIN MORETO. Edited, with Introduction and Notes by ALEXANDER W. HERDLER. (New York: W. R. Jenkins). 12mo, pp. vii, 128.
5. *Spanish in Spanish*, or Spanish as a living language. A practical method of making Spanish the means of its own mastery, by LUIS DUQUE. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. 8vo, pp. 402.

MR. JENKINS, after publishing in 1887 Bretón de los Herreros' comedy *La Independencia*, has lately continued the series of "Teatro Español" with Larra's *Partir á tiempo* and Moreto's *El Desdén con el Desdén*, and begun two additional series, "Cuentos Selectos", and "Novelas Escogidas," with Valera's *El Pájaro Verde* and Alarcón's *El Final de Norma*. Those who take an interest in the teaching of Spanish will be pleased to see a publisher have the courage to enter upon this new field, since we may conclude that the demand for Spanish school-books is growing. Moreover, the announcement that these books appear "with notes" may have drawn a sigh of relief from those who had used *La Independencia*, or Spanish books printed in Spain, and found that even a careful handling of the dictionary left

many a mystery unsolved. Let us see in how far these books come up to our expectations.

Since the editors of nos. 1, 2, and 3 do not state for whom they intend their publications, it is only from the notes that we are able to draw our inference. Here follow the first five of each book. *El Pájaro Verde: Pájaro. Bird. Hubo.* There was. Third person singular, past definite of the impersonal verb "there to be." *Vivimos.* We live. Infinitive "Vivir." *Amado con extremo.* Greatly beloved. *Dilatado.* Vast, extensive.

*Partir á tiempo: En pié,* standing. *En letras,* in bills of exchange. *Pobrecillo,* poor fellow. *Estoy repasando,* I am reviewing. *Vaya,* "that would be more sensible."

*El Final de Norma: Guadalquivir,* from the Arabian "wad-al-kebir," great river, was called "Baltis," modern "Betis." *Á la sazón:* just at the time. *Ostentaba,* imperfect of *ostentar* or *enseñar*, to show. *Esplendurosos,* adjective of the noun *esplendor*, gorgeous, splendid. *Poniente,* or *oeste*, west. It is so called being where the sun sets (*pone*), just as *levante* or *este*, where the sun rises (*levanta*).

It is clear that such notes can be intended only for the very earliest stage of study; we might, therefore, expect the text to be so carefully edited that the learner will get no wrong information from it, or stumble over something that no amount of thought will remove from his path. In *El Pájaro Verde* we find very few misprints, because *í* for *i* is not of sufficient importance to be mentioned here; still *aute* for *ante*, *como* for *como* may cause trouble, and "la Princesa, después de ponerse un elegante *trape* de mañana y de *meteruco precesitos* en unas elegantes babuchas," for *traje* and *meter sus piececitos*, is sufficient to worry any learner.

As for *Partir á tiempo*, modern accentuation has been entirely disregarded. This may not be an important matter in nouns ending in *-ón*, but *tenía*, *sería*, *ánimo*, *sí*, *sinó*, and other like words should not be without accent; after all, it might be just as well to give the learner all the accents the Spanish Academy prescribes, since they are more of an aid than otherwise. We should also like to insist upon "asides" in a play being

printed as such, and not as stage-directions. And once a teacher edits a text for school purposes, the grammar should be correct; the pronouns *le*, *lo* and *la* should be used according to the set rules, even where the author does not discriminate between them. Forms like "*la* he hablado" should not occur in school texts. Alarcón in his *Final de Norma* (Madrid, 1884, probably the last edition revised by him), uses *lo* constantly for masculine singular, direct object, but just as uniformly *le* for feminine indirect object. Why, in the New York edition, the *lo* should occur sometimes corrected as *le*, when referring to a *person*, and as frequently in the same circumstances still be *lo*; why we should find the feminine *le*, as correctly used by the author, changed into *la*, it is impossible to appreciate. Neither is there any apparent advantage in changing in most cases the second person plural pronoun, as a form of address, into *Usted*, while other cases escape the editor's notice.

But we have a more serious objection to *El Final de Norma* as a school-text. An extravagant story like this, written at the age of sixteen, and which the author himself disliked, should not be given to the learner as a measure of an Academician's powers. By all means let us read Alarcón, not *El Final de Norma* nor his somewhat polemical larger novels, but his three volumes of *Novelas Cortas*, his *Capitán Veneno*, and best of all, in advanced classes, his unsurpassable *Sombrero de tres picos*; the student will thus gain a fair estimate of the author's possibilities as a literary artist and he will desire a more extensive acquaintance with this writer.

If we are to edit *with notes*, let us aim high. Let us give an introduction about the author's times, life and works that makes clear his importance; a bibliography that may be a trustworthy guide to those who wish to read other works of each author edited; let us trace in how far the author may already be known in an English garb, or in opera; let us state what dictionary we expect the student to use,<sup>1</sup> and explain *only* what the dictionary does not make clear. Let

<sup>1</sup> Even the bulky Velázquez is not too good; only Tolhausen comes near being satisfactorily complete.



us try to give the text as nearly correct as intelligent proof-reading can make it, since otherwise the advantage of using it is more than doubtful. Do not let us try to make the student believe that *la coulisse* is a call-boy, who is to introduce a new-comer to the family-gathering on the stage; that the *river* Bétis derives its name from the *province* Bética, or the Torre del Oro was so called for any other reason than that here was the chief deposit for American gold. If these requirements are at last regarded as necessary in our French and German texts, why not give the student of Spanish the benefit of the experience we have gained in other branches? Why not select some of the best productions of each author, of Bretón, García Gutiérrez, Hartzembusch, Ayala, Tamayo among the dramatists; of Trueba, Alarcón, Pérez Galdós, Valera, Valdés, Pereda among the novelists; of Becquer, Campoamor, Nuñez de Arce among the poets, and give the students a glimpse of Spanish character, as it finds expression in modern literature?

*El Desdén con el Desdén* (no. 4) is a piece of real classical literature, and of the very best, a play that would afford ample opportunity for skillful editing, because some passages are difficult to understand, written as they are in the "conceptuoso" vein.

A reading of the present edition of this play shows that since editing *Partir á tiempo* Mr. Herdler has concluded to accent Spanish as is done to-day, and has carefully read proof for the accents; in fact, I notice only the mistakes ¿ que tanta? for ¿ qué tanta? (p. 6, line 9); hacia for hácia (p. 44, line 24) mas for más (p. 50, line 9); p. 107, line 6, read mamola. Stage-directions also are in the main correct; however, p. 16, 2 lines from end, we should read Polilla; p. 29, line 21, read *Aparte*; p. 46, line 11-12, after Si haré, read *Aparte*; p. 48, line 10, read *Aparte á Carlos*; p. 56, line 6, read Música; p. 66, line 2, should not be aparte; p. 72, line 8, read *Aparte*; p. 90, line 31, and p. 91, line 22, read *Ap. á Carlos*; p. 93, line 7 and 18, read *Aparte*. Misprints are few; on p. 6, line 27, read polilla; p. 33, line 11, read entre; p. 43, 16, lo, read te; p. 61, line 25, read me ha.

A correction should be made p. 32, at the end:

Desde que al albor primero  
con que amaneció al discurso  
la luz de mi entendimiento  
y el día de la razón,  
fué de mi vida el empleo  
el estudio . . .

I would suggest to read in the first line *aquel* for que al.

Let me now first say something about the Introduction, to offer later a few words concerning the Notes. If Mr. Herdler will permit me to read proof for him in the first two sentences of the Introduction, it will be as follows:

"Don Agustín Moreto y Cabaña was born in *Valencia* (read: Madrid) *about the year 1600* (read: in April, 1618). Very little is known of his life, *save that he died* (read: He died) *as the Rector of* (read: in) the Hospital del Refugio in Toledo, on October 28th, 1668 (read: 1669)."

This information, with a few more facts that might interest students, may be found in the "Discurso Preliminar" to Moreto's works in the Rivadeneyra collection, vol. 39; likewise in Barrera's *Catálogo del teatro antiguo español*; also in Wolf's Supplement to Julius' German translation of Ticknor;<sup>2</sup> moreover in Schaeffer's *Geschichte des Spanischen Nationaldramas*. Ochoa may have been an eminent critic, but since 1838 no other part of Spanish literary history has changed so entirely as that of the drama, and this writer should be consulted only for his opinions, not for his facts.

The rest of the Introduction, as far as it bears upon the language of the play will be considered together with the Notes.

The short remarks on versification which we find on p. vii are also unsatisfactory; not a word being said about hiatus, a student will be at a loss to see why he should scan, in one case:

Porque | no hay con | él que á os | curas

and in another:

Conde | crádi | to es | de la noble | za.

The rule of hiatus in Spanish has puzzled even Morel-Fatio and Krenkel, and if our

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Herdler quotes Ticknor with volume and page without mentioning the edition he uses. Strange to say, the German translation is more serviceable than the English original. Prof. F. M. Warren in his *History of the Novel* always refers (p. 352) to the German edition.



editor has some definite information on the subject, he will do many a worker a service by communicating it. Fortunately we no longer think: "das Beste was du wissen kannst, darfst du den Buben doch nicht sagen." Moreover, when we read: "Iambic verses of three and five feet occur also, as in Act i., Scene i." it would be better to give the lines together with the statement. When we learn that "the four-line stanzas of from six to eight syllables (*letrillas*) are songs written in iambic-anapaestic metre," we should like to see, these *letrillas* scanned, the more so as in the notes the editor thinks it necessary to acquaint the student with Daphne's history, and it would seem that whoever does not know of Daphne will hardly be familiar with the technicalities of verse. Likewise the statement that "either lines 2, 4, 6, etc., rhyme by assonance, or else lines 1 and 4, 2 and 3, 5 and 8, 6 and 7, etc." might have been made of some value by showing the difference between rhyme and assonance in Spanish, by exemplifying the possibilities of assonance in the play, and by indicating why the author sometimes lapses from rhyme into assonance and vice versa. Everything considered, if the whole introduction had been omitted, its absence would not have done violence to the editor's judgment.

To come to the Notes. Mr. Herdler says in his Preface, "the peculiar character of the comedy renders its annotation a task of unusual difficulty." I might venture to omit the word *unusual*, since all the celebrated Spanish plays of the seventeenth century are equally difficult to annotate, chiefly on account of corrupt texts, of passages that are bombast verging upon nonsense, and of the lack of an historical dictionary of Spanish, such as we have for French in Godefroy and Littré. Fortunately our text does not show signs of being corrupt, but as the editor remarks in his Introduction, "occasionally the general excellence of the piece is somewhat marred by plays upon words, or an inclination to bombast." As for the plays upon words, they are characteristic of the Gracioso part in Spanish drama, and a good knowledge of the language will be a key to their meaning, but the bombast can be understood only by a solid array

of parallel readings from contemporary sources, or by special revelation. Fond though I am of trying to solve mysteries of this kind, I confess that there are passages which, even with the aid of our editor's explanations, remain meaningless to me.<sup>3</sup> I should hesitate to attempt the editing of a Spanish play of the Seventeenth century before I had assured myself of the meaning of doubtful passages. Whoever has seen Krenkel's edition of Calderon's *Mágico Prodigioso* will remember his "Excurs zu iii, 63, ff.," where, after submitting five compact pages of thorough learning, even he does not dare to pronounce an opinion and says:

"Welche von beiden Erklärungen den Vorzug verdiene, wird sich erst dann ausmachen lassen, wenn noch mehr Parallelen aus spanischen Schriftstellern gesammelt und zur Vergleichung herangezogen sind."

I should not advocate making our Spanish text-books ponderous tomes of learned disquisitions on all difficult points, but if an obscure passage requires several pages of notes for its elucidation, the student will derive more benefit from their perusal than from that of a few lines of unsatisfactory explanation.

Concerning a few passages I should like to submit explanations different from those offered by the editor. Without laying stress upon the notes to p. 11, which propound some matters of Greek mythology and remind one of the prologue to the first part of the *Quijote*, and without proposing to mention every case where I merely suspect the exact meaning was missed, I note the following:

P. 20, line 20:

se le vayan los ojos, hechos fuentes,  
tras cualquiera galán. . .

*hechos fuentes* means here, not "changed into mirrors" but 'into fountains,' that is, 'she will cry her eyes out.' For, how *her* attention could be attracted by changing *her* eyes into mirrors, is more than I can see.

P. 27, line 25:

. . . vengo hasta aquí,  
como hace fuerte el verano,  
á pie . . .

<sup>3</sup> V. gr., p. 16, lines 19-23; p. 50, lines 11-15; p. 70 the wonderful song:

El que solo de su abril, etc.

not "since summer is at its height" but 'I come on foot all this distance, since summer gives strength.' Polilla is speaking nonsense in the whole scene, and the enervating effect of a Spanish summer is well known.

P. 38, line 13:

¡ Que bravo botón de fuego !  
Échala de ese vinagre,  
y verás para su tiempo  
qué bravo escabeche sale,

not "what an inflammable substance you are to her!" but: 'How well you are cauterizing her.' Polilla is fond of medical terms and of medical advice (cf. p. 6, line 5, where, by the way, "tiras algo á bermejo" means: "you are of a sanguine temperament," so excitement is liable to bring about apoplexy; also pp. 26-30; p. 43, line 30; p. 46, 11, etc.) and his remark here means: "This is the way to treat her complaint."

P. 40, line 15:

. . . fingimiento.  
POLILLA. Señor, llóvalo adelante,  
y verás si no da fuego.

not: "dar fuego, to take fire (that is to fall in love,)" but 'set her afire, cause her to fall in love,' *fingimiento* being the subject (compare p. 26, line 10, and p. 72, line 9.)

P. 42, line 23:

Hazle un favor, golpe en bola,  
de cuando en cuando al cuitado.

Compare p. 47, line 24, "hazle un favorcillo al vuelo," and translate: "show him some kindness the first time occasion offers, unhesitatingly."

P. 42, line 33:

más entero que bolsa de miserable

not: "more unyielding than a beggar's purse," but: 'than a miser's purse.'

P. 48, line 16: engañar á dos carrillos.

This is not simply "to deceive with both cheeks, a strong expression for duplicity." *Comer á dos carrillos* means: 'to eat unmanly' (the *Siete Partidas* says it is "manera de bestias mas que de homes;") therefore our passage means: 'shameful deception.'

P. 56, line 22: el nácar, is not "the rose color," but 'mother-of-pearl color,' though in the seventeenth-century plays we will find it to mean a shade of red, which Salvá in his

Dictionary (Paris, Garnier, 1885) names *rouge orangé*.

P. 59, line 28:

¡ Cómo aquí á hablar no acierta  
mi vanidad, de corrida ?

*de corrida* means here, not "abashed though I am," but 'why does not my vanity for very shame, prompt me what to say?'

P. 62, line 20:

DIANA. Decid que estoy indisputa.  
que me ha dado un accidente.  
CARLOS. Luego con eso licencia  
me dais para no asistir.

not: "that I have met with an accident," but: 'that I have fainted.' Diana's having met with an accident would be the reverse of an excuse for a gallant to leave her.

P. 63, 10:

DIANA. Hame dado un accidente.  
POLILLA. Si es cosa de la cabeza,  
dos parches de tacamaca,  
y que te traigan las piernas.

The last line does not mean "let them bring you legs," nor "let your legs bring you," and therefore not "come to see the fête," but: 'let them rub your legs' in order to relieve your head.

P. 67, line 16:

pese á mi alma,

not "though it grieve me to the very heart," but 'hang it!'

P. 69, line 9: Polilla compares the ladies with "el cardo" of which only the interior is of use. This is not "the thistle" but 'the artichoke.' In what country are thistles raised by gardeners and sold as food?

P. 72, line 8:

Otro correo dispara,  
mas no dan lumbre los tiros.

not: "a figurative expression meaning to shoot; the proper expression would be: mandar un mensajero," but a play upon the meanings of *correo*, a messenger, and a bomb; translation: 'she shoots off another bomb, but her shots do not set you afire,' (compare what was remarked to p. 40, line 15).

P. 73, line 14:

DIANA. ¡ Yo despreciada !  
POLILLA. Eso sí, (Ap.)  
pese á su alma, dé brincos.

not: "what do I care if it pain her to the very heart provided I can leap for joy," but 'confound her, let her be furious.'

P. 79, line 20. Lope was not called "el fénix español" because "he restored Spain to her former literary eminence" of which in his time nobody had any knowledge, but merely because there was only one Lope in the world.

P. 80, line 20:

. . el perro del hortelano.

not: "the gardner's dog who dislikes to see goats and oxen eat cabbage because he himself despises it," but 'who begrudges others what is of no use to himself, the dog in the manger.'

P. 82, line 22:

DIANA. ¿Que pudiera ser, no infieres,  
que saliese yo con él?

POLILLA. Sí, señora; pero él  
sabe poco de poderes.

not: "he knows little of possibilities (he deals in realities)," but a play upon the meanings of *poder*, the verb, and *poder*, a power of attorney.

P. 84, line 15:

PRÍNCIPE. Proseguid el dulce acento  
que nuestra dicha celebra.

CARLOS. Yo seré imán de sus ecos.

not: "I shall be the subject of her (Diana's) conversation," but: 'I shall follow their melodies.' (compare p. 85, line 7:

¿me llamas,  
cuando ves que voy siguiendo  
este acento enamorado?)

P. 86, line 24:

DIANA. se ha de abrasar, ó no es hombre.

POLILLA. Eso fuera á no estar hecho  
el defensivo, y pegado.

not: "if he were not by nature unapproachable and stubborn," but: 'if the cooling plaster had not been applied.'

P. 89 line 6:

. . estamos hechos  
tan debajo de una causa . .

not: "we are made so exactly in the same mould," but 'we were born so exactly under the same star,'

P. 89, line 31:

Como diestro  
herir por los mismos filos;  
que esa es doctrina del negro.

The last line does not simply mean: "this is very clever indeed" nor does it "probably

derive its meaning from necromancia," but: 'this is fencing tactics.' The "espada negra" was the practising sword, compared with "espada blanca" or "de matar."

P. 92, line 11:

el sangriento labio,  
que fino coral vertiendo,  
parece que se ha teñido  
en la herida que me ha hecho.

The second line is not exactly "sparkling like fine corals," but "dripping with (my) blood," of course to be taken as bombast.

P. 92, line 24: For "Carlos is now sorry." . . read 'C. pretends to be sorry.' . .

P. 93, line 18:

DIANA. Yo pierdo el entendimiento.  
. . este es un incendio.

POLILLA. Eso no es sino bramante (Ap.)

*bramante* is not "storm," but: 'amorous desire' (compare p. 46, line 6:

Sé tretas bravas  
con que has de hacerle bramar)

P. 107, line 4: I would prefer to say, instead of "I shall not marry you:" 'I cannot marry you, since I am only a servant and below you in rank.'

In conclusion let me say that the editor deserves our thanks for making Moreto's best play available for class use, although the edition is far from perfect, but the defects can be remedied in a subsequent edition, for which I trust there will soon be a demand. If Mr. Herdler should feel inclined to edit further Spanish classics, there are two ways of going about it: either undertake the extraordinary amount of study which a good annotated edition requires, or simply give a careful text-reprint. There is room for both in American classes, and the number of plays that would deserve consideration could not be exhausted in many years.

*Spanish in Spanish* (no. 5) is a very neat looking volume. As for the utility of the book, if the authpr can bring forward any person who has learned Spanish by the aid of this work, I should only be convinced the more of the truth that any method is good for one who *wants* to learn. In the present state of instruction in modern languages, books of this kind should not receive attention.

F. DEHAAN.

Johns Hopkins University.



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April 1895.

## VICTOR HUGO IN THE ESTIMATION OF HIS COUNTRYMEN.

TEN years have elapsed since Victor Hugo, the most extraordinary man that France has ever produced, was carried to his resting place in the Pantheon. For his sake, the Church of Ste. Geneviève, which since the Restoration had been devoted to religious worship, was secularized by the Government and destined anew for a burial place of great men deserving the gratitude of the nation. On the first of June, 1885, the remains of the great poet were conveyed from the *Arc de Triomphe* in the *Champs-Élysées*, where they had been lying in state, to the crypt on Mount Geneviève. Never before had the Parisians witnessed a funeral procession accompanied by such tumultuous popular demonstrations, as when the plain hearse of the millionaire-poet passed along the avenues and boulevards, crowded with half a million of the population.

As the recollection of these scenes of a decade ago, and of similar outbursts of popular enthusiasm during Victor Hugo's life-time, associates itself with an estimation of his life and work, a desire to view the figure of the famous man in the light in which it rises before the eyes of his own countrymen grows stronger and stronger. There are good reasons for believing that only Frenchmen, and not many of them, can appreciate V. Hugo's work in its entirety. Only a French heart can feel strongly enough for the distinguished poet and great citizen to forget the ridiculous, and remember the sublime, which are so strangely mingled in his personality and in his productions.

On the sixth of January, 1829, when V. Hugo was in his twenty-seventh year, Désiré Nisard wrote these words:

"Have you read the new Odes of V. Hugo?—'They are absurd,' says a voice at my right... 'They are incomparably beautiful,' says one at my left... You imagine whence the two answers came; from the enemies and from the partisans of the poet. These two have hitherto formed his entire public."

These words were true not only in 1829, but

they have remained true during nearly the whole of V. Hugo's career; he seems to have had few impartial readers and critics till within the last ten or fifteen years.

Fifty-seven years later, in 1886, within a year after the poet's death, the same critic just quoted wrote: "V. Hugo has not attained the glory of one perfect production." This statement also holds true if we except a certain number of his lyrical poems; it expresses the common opinion of all, save the blindest admirers of the poet.

There are many reasons why Frenchmen should harbor for their illustrious countryman feelings of pride and admiration. The people saw in him the reflection of its own genius. He had maintained a superb attitude toward imperial usurpation, and his political and social ideas seemed to many to have been justified by the tragic end of the Second Empire; the unthinking millions had been captivated by his utopian ideas and his insane flatteries to the people of Paris. His brilliant literary genius was justly admired by the whole civilized world. Aside from all this, the circumstances surrounding his earlier career were such as to endear him to the hearts of those familiar with them.

V. Hugo's precocity was in some respects different from that of other great poets. Of course, he wrote verses early in life; his first poetic essays date from 1813, when he was eleven years old. At fifteen, he had composed a melodrama in three acts (*Inez de Castro*), a comic opera, and a number of poems. About the same time, in 1817, he competed for the French Academy's annual prize for poetry and received 'honorable mention' for his poem of three hundred lines on the *Advantages of Study*. His first novel (*Bug Jargal*) was also written at this period—upon a wager, in two weeks—and his first *Odes* brought him from the literary society of Toulouse two prizes and subsequently the title of *maître des jeux floraux*.

But the boy Hugo wrote not only verses for his amusement. He had made up his mind to be a poet. "I will be Chateaubriand or nothing," he had written upon his copy-book when

a boy of fourteen, and he set himself to his task in good earnest. At seventeen he founded, in company with his two brothers, of whom the oldest was twenty-one, a literary journal, *le Conservateur littéraire*, (the name of Chateaubriand's journal was *le Conservateur*). A complete set of this journal, from December, 1819, till March, 1821, has been discovered by Edmond Biré.\* Some entire numbers are from the pen of Victor, and prove that the young critic was not only master of an excellent style but possessed remarkable critical acumen as well.

V. Hugo's celebrity, however, dates from the publication of his first volume of *Odes* in 1822. The story of the origin of one of these poems is worth telling. On the night of February 4th, 1819, Victor was watching at the bed-side of his sick mother. She expressed her disappointment at his neglect to compete for a certain prize. After she had fallen asleep the boy went to work, and on the next morning he put into her hands the finished ode on the *Restoration of the Statue of Henry the Fourth*.

The study of V. Hugo's works reminds one, again and again, of a remark once made by the poet himself: "It is my childhood that has made my mind what it is." An imagina-

\*EDMOND BIRÉ'S *V. Hugo avant 1830* (1 vol.), *V. Hugo après 1830* (2 vols.), *V. Hugo après 1852* (1 vol.), are among the most valuable contributions to the biography of the poet. Other valuable aids in the study of V. Hugo are: CHRENOUVIER, *V. Hugo le Poète*; E. DUPUY, *V. Hugo, l'homme et le poète*; L. MABILLEAU, *V. Hugo*; PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Le théâtre en France*; J. LEMAÎTRE, *Les Contemporains*; SAINTE-BEUVE, *Portraits contemporains*; NISARD, *Essays sur l'Ecole romantique*; E. FAGUET, *Etudes littéraires*; F. BRUNETIÈRE, *Nouvelles questions de critique*; G. PELLISIER, *Le mouvement littéraire au 19<sup>ème</sup> siècle*; E. HENNEQUIN, *Etudes de critique scientifique*; A. GUYAN, *l'Art au point de vue sociologique*; LOUIS VEUILLOT, *Etudes sur V. Hugo*; PAUL DE SAINT-VICTOR, *V. Hugo*; ALFRED BARBOU, *V. Hugo et son temps*; ALFRED ASSELINE, *V. Hugo intime*; GUSTAVE RIVET, *V. Hugo chez lui*; A. CHALLAMEL, *Souvenirs d'un Hugolâtre*; D'Heylli, *Documents de la guerre de 1870-71: Victor Hugo et la Commune*; Louis Ulbach, *Almanach de V. Hugo*; Gustave Larroumet, *La Maison de V. Hugo*; E. Biré, *L'Année 1817*; E. Deschanel, *Lamartine* (2 vols.); also numerous articles in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, and the autobiographical *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie*. The plan of this essay precludes reference to any but French works on V. Hugo. Still, attention is called to a valuable article in 'Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung,' Munich, June 12, 1894: 'Neues über Victor Hugo,' by Professor Joseph Sarrazin.

tion naturally strong could not but be stimulated in an extraordinary degree by the ever-changing scenes and too vivid impressions which were crowded into the first ten years of his life. Before he had reached this age, little Victor had been taken by his mother, the wife of one of Napoleon's generals, to the islands of Corsica and Elba; he had listened, in the kingdom of Naples, to the story of the exploits of Fra Diavolo, the famous bandit whom his father had captured; he had crossed the Pyrenees and occupied with his parents a luxurious palace in Madrid and attended in the same city the 'College of Nobles,' a 'sinister convent,' where the discipline was austere and the amusements even lugubrious; on Sundays the boys were taken to the cemetery for exercise. No wonder that the garden of the Feuillantines, where Mme Hugo, with her three boys, took up her abode after her return to Paris, in 1812, appeared to him like a haven of peace of which he later made the scene of the 'Idyl of the Rue Plumet' in *Les Misérables*. The names of two places, Hernani and Torquemada, where the family had stopped on the journey to Madrid, were afterward chosen by the poet as titles of two of his dramas. A reminiscence of the picture gallery in the Masserano palace is found in the scene of Ruy Gomez in *Hernani*. Elespuru and Gubetta, the two hateful characters in *Cromwell* and *Lucretia Borgia*, bear the names of two boys with whom the Hugo brothers fought at the convent school; but nothing excited the imagination of the boy so strongly as the hideous form of a dwarf-like valet that waited upon the sons of princes and nobles at the same school: the repulsive creations of Han d'Islande, of Triboulet in *The King Makes Merry*, and of Quasimodo in *Notre Dame de Paris*, owe their origin to this deformed creature.

Aside from these and other reminiscences of early impressions, it cannot be doubted that his early acquaintance with Spain and Southern Italy and the exciting, eventful scenes which history was unrolling before his eyes, determined, in a general way, the grand, magnificent, extravagant turn of his imagination. The same causes also explain the preference of the great French poet for the Span-



ish drama, "with its taste for the improbable and absurd in the play of the passions and of chance."

The unusual conditions of young Hugo's first acquaintance with the outside world receive all the more significance from the fact that his education in the narrower sense of the word, the mental discipline and training derived from teaching and from books, was by no means such as to insure that all-sided development of the mental faculties requisite for a well-balanced mind. It is true, he enjoyed regular instruction for five or six years, but in his reading he was absolutely without guidance, and although he mentions in his lyrics the Bible, Virgil and Homer as his favorite books, it is known from other sources that he read indiscriminately all sorts of books, among them Voltaire and Rousseau, his mother being of opinion that books could do no harm.

At all events, when V. Hugo entered upon his literary career with the set purpose of enlightening his nation and his age, his information as well as his mental training, were absurdly inadequate for such a task. And yet no other poet ever had a more exalted idea of his mission, or proclaimed it so frequently and with such emphasis, as V. Hugo. For sixty years, from the preface to his first *Odes*, in 1822, till the time of his death, he reasserts the high claims of the Poet in prefaces, lyrics and epics, and assigns to him attributes so varied that no other vocation can claim them all: the Poet is a worker, a teacher, a prophet, a holy dreamer, a sage, a thinker, a reformer; he is a judge, and avenger; he is Atlas carrying the globe; he is not only the first of critics but also the highest of philosophers.

How near to this lofty and unattainable ideal did V. Hugo come? What was his character, his life; and what the work he accomplished?

Goodness, universal kindness, gentleness combined with energy of action, sympathy with suffering humanity, pity for the sinner and great readiness to forgive, we are told, were his chief virtues, and again and again, in his prose and verse, do these traits rise to the surface. Neither can it be maintained that they are lacking in his actual life. The sincerity of V. Hugo's family affections cannot be doubted, notwithstanding a not infrequent

lack of tact in their manifestation, and even in spite of the presence, during fifty years of the poet's life, of 'Mme. Drouet'—an enigma which baffles the ordinary moral understanding.

V. Hugo's earnestness and faithful industry, the ardor with which he performed his literary task, day after day, through his long life, and the courage and hopefulness which never left him during his exile, whether enforced or voluntary, are traits of character well worth our admiration. There is also a certain manliness in V. Hugo's contempt for critics and in his principle to amend his old works by producing better ones. On the other hand, there is ample proof that the *man* was not indifferent to the critics, though the *poet* disdained to heed their advice. Scores of passages from his poems might be quoted in which he takes brutal revenge on those who had the boldness to find fault with some of his verses or to ridicule his political speeches; such offences he would remember forty years, and more, after they had been committed.

The sad truth is, that the homage and adulation, of which the young poet became the object especially since he occupied such a commanding position as the leader of the Romantic movement, about 1830, awakened in him an enormous pride. The consequence was that he soon had no longer any friends, but only subjects and worshippers, young men who could say with Théophile Gautier:

"If I were so unfortunate as to believe that a line of V. Hugo's could be bad, I should not dare confess it to myself, all alone, in the cellar, without a candle."

V. Hugo's marvelous imagination and gift of versification, his lack of philosophical training, the indiscriminate admiration of his friends, and the astounding ignorance of the young *littérateurs* who formed his circle of acquaintances, were the cause of his belief in his own superiority as a thinker. His vanity, "equal to his genius, which was immense," soon became the ruling passion of his life. Its ludicrous side may be illustrated by an anecdote told by Turgenieff:

"The 'master' was leaning upon the mantelpiece, surrounded by his disciples. One of these having expressed the wish that the street



on which V. Hugo was living might receive his name, the objection was made that it was too small, that one of the largest thoroughfares of Paris ought to be thus honored. But the enthusiasm of some of the poet's admirers did not stop here: it was claimed that all Paris ought to be named the 'City of Victor Hugo.' Whereupon the 'master' approvingly said: "The time will come, sir; the time will come (*ça viendra!*)"

But V. Hugo's vanity led to worse things than ridicule; it beguiled him into disguising and distorting the truth. Ambition, and, we are glad to believe, patriotism impelled V. Hugo to add political renown to his literary fame. During his youth and early manhood he shared the political faith of his mother, who was a native, not exactly, as he claims, of the *Vendée*, the ancient stronghold of royalism, but of Brittany. His *Odes* celebrate in enthusiastic strains of wonderful richness the "throne and the altar." Several of them show decided hostility to Bonaparte. In 1827, the year in which he wrote the preface to *Cromwell*, the manifesto of the Romantic school, he cast off the traditions both of classicism and of royalism. His next two volumes of lyrics, the *Orientales* (1829) and *Autumn Leaves* (1831), reveal a growing liberalism and especially an increasing admiration for the glory and power of the First Empire (*Napoléon, ce dieu, dont tu seras le prêtre*). Still, under the Orleans dynasty V. Hugo was warmly attached to the cause of monarchy. He was on almost intimate terms with Louis Philippe and with his son, the Duke of Orleans. If he had in earlier years accepted a pension from Louis XVIII, and the cross of the Legion of Honor from Charles X, whom as late as 1829 he assured of his loyalty and devotion, he was by the 'Citizen King' made an officer of the Legion of Honor and, in 1845, a peer of France, and he addressed to him the words: "Sire, God and France have need of you." Furthermore, remembering that his father, General Hugo, had been made a Count by King Joseph of Spain, which title, however, had never been recognized in France, the poet signed himself for years *Viscount Victor Hugo*. More than this; his aristocratic aspirations made him seek his ancestry in a noble Hugo family whose pedigree he traces back some three or four hundred years, and readers of

*Les Misérables* and *Notre Dame*, and of his book *Le Rhin*, will remember that he introduces his fictitious noble ancestors in these works.

In 1841, V. Hugo, entered the French Academy, and he was probably the most famous man in France when, in 1848, after the downfall of the Orleans monarchy, he took his seat in the Constituent Assembly as a deputy from Paris. These political inconsistencies, amidst the frequent changes of government in France, were in themselves not very strange; they seemed quite natural in the case of a man whose ideas, according to the most enlightened and dispassionate French critics, were "only reflexes of the ideas of his age"; his political changes were merely "modifications of his aptitude to reflect."

But it is more than strange, it is past believing, that vanity, or any other motive, should have inveigled V. Hugo into an attempt to prove to the world his consistency in political matters. In vain did he mutilate and alter passages in his works while boldly asserting that he had changed nothing; in vain did he ante-date poems and articles in order to assign his royalist tendencies to the years of his youth; his own emphatic assertions of the "fixity of his opinions," of the "immutable firmness of his principles," were of no more avail than the assurances of his friends that V. Hugo "never denied his past," that he has "never blushed to recall his early opinions." In 1850 he was a member of the extreme radical wing of the Republican party, and from that time on he remained a staunch Republican. After his return to France, in 1870, he was elected to the National Assembly, which, in 1871, held its meetings at Bordeaux, but he resigned his seat after a few months. Four years later, he once more entered politics as senator for life. At all times, whether a royalist, Bonapartist, or republican, he has been a friend of the people. In so far there was unity in his political life. But his influence upon public affairs in France was never of any importance.

The frequent outbursts of religious feeling in V. Hugo's writings, especially in his lyrics, must have invited many a reader to speculation on the poet's religion; but none, it is to be

presumed, have succeeded in defining his faith, either from his poetical confessions or from biographical data. In his earlier years, as far back as 1820-22, V. Hugo was as fervent a Catholic as any royalist of the time. Later, the negative element, the definitions of the God in whom he does *not* believe, are much more clearly stated than the positive. He has given expression to his religious ideas in several of his longer poems at various epochs; for example, in the poem entitled 'Wisdom' (1840), the last piece of *Lights and Shadows*; in the last number of *Contemplations* (1855); in the poem 'To the Bishop who calls me an atheist,' in *L'Année terrible* (1870); but his language is so vague and the thought so mystic as almost to defy analysis. Occasionally a simpler outpouring of the heart meets us in his pages, as in these lines of the poem in *Contemplations*, written at the spot on the Seine where the poet's daughter and her husband were drowned:

"I come to thee, oh Lord, Father, in whom I must believe!  
 Apeased, I bring to thee  
 The fragments of this heart, full of thy glory,  
 Which thou hast broken.  
 I come to thee, oh Lord! confessing that thou art  
 Kind, merciful, indulgent, gentle, oh living God!  
 I own, thou only know'st what thou art doing,  
 And man is but a reed set trembling by the wind."

In 1848 V. Hugo was a fervent admirer of Pope Pius IX, who "points out the right and safe path to all kings, nations, statesmen, and thinkers." Scarcely three years later, in the *Châtiments*, he calls the same pope a 'butcher' and compares him to Alexander Borgia.

Charles Renouvier, one of the most philosophical of all the writers on V. Hugo, sums up the political and religious phases of the poet in these words:

"He has been successively all that the century has been, except a materialist and atheist. He has been Bonapartist, royalist, catholic, liberal monarchist, a vague deist, pantheist, a groping socialist, republican, absolute democrat, . . . a prophet profuse of blessings and of curses, metempsychosist, messianist, manichean, and millenarian."

But it is time to speak of those qualities of V. Hugo's *mind* which constitute the real source and power of his unquestionable genius. And here again, it behooves first to protest against the extravagant claims of some of his

followers. Every reader of V. Hugo's poetry and novels must at times have been exasperated by the dazzling array of historical and geographical names of which he is so fond. Thus, in the conclusion of the poem on the 'Battle of Sedan,' in *L'Année terrible*, we count forty proper names in eighteen lines; fifty-four names of persons, more or less known in history or literature, are introduced to help establish the fact that the plebiscite in 1870 was not the true verdict of the people; in a single letter in *Le Rhin* occur sixty-two dates and four hundred and sixty proper names!

Whether we may credit or not the poet's own statement that such enormous special information was stored in his memory, it is certain that those are mistaken who see in this display of erudition the proof of great learning. V. Hugo's memory was phenomenal but purely formal, retaining only the outward aspect of things; as his universal curiosity led him from his early childhood to devour all kinds of books, his memory must have been filled with a great mass of names and facts. A liberal use of these, combined with a great profusion of images and an occasional lack of coherence, will make the understanding of an author difficult. It is therefore possible that certain parts of the *Legend of Ages*, for example, to be understood, "require a degree of attention, a faculty of abstraction, a rapidity of thought, analogous to that which a Plato or Empedocles were wont to expect of their disciples," without *necessarily* involving great profundity or originality of thought.

It is a curious fact that the brightest of minds, even among the poet's own countrymen, are by no means agreed as to the rank to be assigned to V. Hugo as a thinker; their discussions of this question are not quite lacking in a comical element. Individual readers will of course discover serious thought where others do not see anything of the kind. So much, however, may be considered as settled at the present time, that V. Hugo did not fulfill a high mission as a philosopher; his philosophy of life was tainted with such a confusion of passion, duty, and law, that its influence, as far as it went, could not be beneficial. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that many single pieces and separate



passages in his works possess a wonderful power and breathe the spirit of profound human sympathy. More than this: Brunetière reminds us that while V. Hugo's ideas are few and of narrow range, seldom new and not often his own, new relations of ideas, enriching and advancing thought, result from his original, unexpected association of words. The poet himself is well aware of the important rôle, in his writings, of words as generators of ideas: "And I knew well," he says in *Contemplations*, "that the angry hand, which liberates the word, also sets free the idea." The influence of a reform of language upon the transformation of ideas can be traced in more than one period of French literature.

Our poet has also, unwittingly perhaps, and certainly without the intention of furnishing the key-note to his critics, stated one of the most striking characteristics of his genius, his power of echoing the ideas of his time:

"Love and the tomb, and fame, and life,  
The gliding waves, in infinite succession,  
Each breeze, each fatal or propitious ray,  
Makes my own crystal soul vibrate with light;  
My thousand-voiced soul, which God, whom I adore,  
Has, a *sonorous echo*, placed in the midst of all,"

(*Feuilles d'automne.*)

V. Hugo's faculty of observation was extraordinary. His physical vision was very quick and of such vigor that he never used glasses, even in his old age. "His eye never rests upon a tower," says Sainte-Beuve, "without his counting the angles, sides and points." But it seems that, while his eye was attracted by the strongest reliefs, the most salient points, it was little sensible to color: his own pencil and crayon sketches are lacking in color distinctions, but exhibit strong light and shade effects. Psychologists tell us that a person's manner of seeing affects his manner of visualizing, and it is therefore not surprising that V. Hugo's poetic images are almost always marked by strong contrasts. Antithesis is the strongest characteristic of his style; not only his language, his form of expression, is antithetical, but he thinks in antitheses, and the contents of his poems and chapters, the characters of his dramas and novels, are almost without exception combinations of opposite elements. This tendency could not but prove dangerous to a poet of such marvelous gift of

imagination and unparalleled power of expression. His incredible facility of creating new expressions for the same idea, apparent already in his earliest productions, led in his later works to unheard of excesses. The idea that Marat was both good and bad, ferocious and charitable, is in one of his latest poems ('l'Echafaud,' in *Toute la lyre*) expressed by thirty-five different images, followed by a dozen more referring to Marat's companions, whom the poet designates as "compassionate tigers" and "formidable lambs."

Often, this profusion of images forms a series of exclamations and apostrophes: on a single page in the *Legend of Ages* there are thirteen sentences all beginning with *Quoi!* 'What!', and all expressive of the poet's indignation at the degeneracy of the descendants of Wilhelm Tell and Arnold von Winkelried. In the novel '1793,' Gauvain, the republican, learns that his uncle Lantenac, the royalist, has fallen into his power. The young soldier's struggle between love and admiration for his highminded relative, and duty toward the Republic, is described by the author with wonderful imaginative power; the chapter includes many well-placed antitheses and effective images, but this struggle between the 'pros' and 'cons' is continued through *twenty-seven* pages, and the reader wearies in spite of all the poetic beauty of language and thought.

V. Hugo's imaginative power shows itself especially in his frequent and strange personifications; no other poet has with equal spontaneity transformed inanimate objects, natural forces, and moral phenomena and ideas into living beings: walls pierced by cannon balls *agonize*; trees endeavor to *escape*; the battles which Napoleon fought *lean* over his brow as he is resting on his couch; haughty England *rests her elbow* on his bed; his victories, sculptured in marble, *make signs* with their fingers and *hear* the emperor weep: the tree in the forest *consents* to all beneficent uses at the hand of man; it is willing to become a plough-tail, a mast for the ship, a pillar for the house, a log on the fire-place; but "tree, wilt thou become a gallows?" "Silence, man! Away axe! I belong to life!" The cannon on ship-board, which has broken loose from its cable, becomes:



"a furious beast, a monster, *rushing* upon the sailors, now plunging forward, now retreating; now it stops and *meditates*, then it flies like an arrow across the deck, whirls about, rears, attacks, kills, exterminates . . . you can reason with a mastiff, stun a bull, charm a boa, frighten a tiger, soothe a lion; but nothing avails with this monster: you cannot kill it, it is dead; and at the same time it *lives*; it lives a sinister life. . ."

The passage is too long to be quoted in full; what has been given is about one-fifth of the whole. The author becomes intoxicated with his own metaphors, and the reader is stunned by their flow.

The purest abstractions assume in the poet's mind visible forms endowed with personal qualities; justice *bleeds*, nothingness *laughs*, the shade *cries*; so does the morning dawn; the infinite becomes a "horrible receding porch"; the shade, a "hydra of which the nights form the pale vertebrae." His mythological genius rivals with primitive man in the power of personifying natural forces and phenomena.

There is no denying that V. Hugo's rhetoric deserves all the criticism that has been passed upon it: redundancy, verbosity, bombast are only too common faults of his. And his vocabulary is often exasperating. Jules Lemaître calls him the "greatest collector of words that has ever lived since the creation of the world"; according to Brunetière he is the "most wonderful verbal artist" and the "most extraordinary collector of rhymes and rhythms that France has ever seen;" and Faguet says: "His genius of enumeration is such as to get the better of all dictionaries."

And yet it is through his style that V. Hugo has exerted the greatest influence upon his age. In the political field and in the realm of thought he has accomplished little, though it be not denied that "from the early years of our century he has waged a moral warfare for human emancipation, for intellectual and political freedom." As a dramatist he has many superiors in French literature; he cared too little for historical and human truth, his characters are not living men and women; the lyric tone, so common in his dramas, the continual intervention of the poet himself, who endows his characters with his own imagination instead of letting them speak from their

hearts; the prevalence of social and moral extremes and of excessive sentiment, these and other faults cause the poet to fall short of his own ideals as set forth in his prefaces. Whatever success his plays have won—including the famous victory, so often told, which he and his lieutenants of the Romantic School carried off at the sound of Hernani's bugle—has been due mainly to the irresistible power of his language and the magic flow of his verse.

V. Hugo's epic and lyric poetry has left a stronger impress upon French literature than his dramas. The truly grand pictures of his first *Legend of Ages*; the epic portions of his novels, such as the description of the battle of Waterloo in *Les Misérables*, and among his later works the 'Battle of Sedan' in *L'Année terrible*, and the *Art of Being a Grandfather*, with its contrasts of infinite tenderness and wrathful indignation, establish V. Hugo's position as an "epic poet of the highest order and marvelous power." No hostile criticism can point out a greater master of word-painting, or one more skillful and original in description and narration.

His lyrics are of an endless variety and of very unequal merit. Often they are deficient in warmth of feeling, and the intimate relation, the perfect harmony, between thought and expression, is sometimes lacking: the amazing art of the versifier occasionally overwhelms or stifles the emotions of the genuine poet, and the resulting disproportion or incongruity produces a chilling effect upon the reader. The *Châtiments* is, perhaps, the only volume of the poet in which his power of feeling never falls short of his power of expression; but in these poems hatred is unfortunately the power that stirs the poet's soul.

Still, with all their shortcomings, his numerous lyrical compositions contain so much of the highest order, that few will deny V. Hugo the title of the greatest French lyricist. Modern French poetry received through him the strongest and most varied impulses: in place of the vague and abstract style of the pseudo-classic school he brought to it vigor, plasticity, and brilliancy.

"The modern 'realists' and 'naturalists' owe to him the perception of life and the taste

for describing all its manifestations; the 'parnassiens' are indebted to him for the revelation of the plastic value of words; and the 'symbolists' and 'décadents' for the intuition of word-music and delicate harmony of sound and idea."

The revival of many old words long since passed out of use, and their introduction into modern literature; the new meanings given to familiar words and the new relations established between them; the countless new images created with a power far superior to that of any other French writer: the enrichment, by these means, of the language without doing it violence or departing from correct usage; in short, the invention of a style which was nothing less than a revolution in the French language—all this was undeniably achieved by Victor Hugo. To close with the words of an eminent critic of the day:

"Less original in thought and feeling than Lamartine, de Vigny, and Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo is more original in style than Lamartine, than de Vigny, than Chateaubriand, than Rousseau, than Mme de Sévigné, than Racine; and I only pause before the name of Lafontaine. He has created for himself a manner of diction in a language which had been existing as a literary language for four centuries, and which had been regenerated at least three times. It seems like a miracle!"

A. LODEMAN.

*Ypsilanti, Mich.*

#### THE RELATIONS OF THE EARLIEST

##### *Portuguese Lyric School with the Troubadours and Trouvères.*

In his valuable treatise entitled *Ueber die erste Portugiesische Kunst- und Hoffpoesie*, which was based on the study of the four hundred and thirty-seven Portuguese lyric poems then accessible in Varnhagen's edition of the Lisbon codex<sup>1</sup> and Moura's *Cancioneiro d'El-Rei D. Diniz*,<sup>2</sup> Diez, inquiring into the traces of Provençal influence on the Galecio-Portuguese poets, remarks:

"It will, however, hardly be possible to point out, in the productions of this poetic school thus far edited, poems or passages imitated or translated from the Provençal."

<sup>1</sup> *Trovas e Cantares de um codice do xiv seculo . . . .* publicados por F. A. de Varnhagen, Madrid, 1849.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, 1847.

Though the respectable body of one thousand six hundred and thirty-three poems has since become accessible through the publication of the two Italian codices,<sup>3</sup> the opinion expressed by Diez in 1863 has lost comparatively little of its validity.

How, it is natural to ask, are we to explain that while the employment of certain poetic compositions and devices, and the terms assigned to them, are unmistakable proofs of the Provençal influence, the Portuguese poets do not appear to have closely imitated or reproduced either the structure or the contents of Provençal or French poems?

The constant state of unrest and unsafety in which the new kingdom of Portugal was kept during the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century by its incessant wars against the Moors and its Christian rival states Castile and Leon, did not permit the Portuguese kings and nobles to indulge in that life of ease and pleasure which is indispensable to the cultivation of music and song, and which alone could have tempted the foreign troubadours to visit their castles.

While we know that Count Philip of Flanders, one of the most famous knights of his time and a warm friend of the trouvères, on his second voyage to Palestine in 1177, visited the court of King Alphonse Henriques, whose daughter Theresa he married in 1181;<sup>4</sup> that the second king of Portugal, Sancho I (1185-1211), maintained at his court two French minstrels,<sup>5</sup> and that the infante Pedro of Aragon, who in the same year ascended the throne as Pedro II, in 1196 came to Coimbra to make peace between Portugal and Castile,<sup>6</sup> on which visit, enthusiastic and liberal friend of the troubadours as he was, he may have been accompanied by Provençal or Catalan singers, we have no evidence of the stay of any Provençal troubadours in Portugal, nor is this

<sup>3</sup> *Il Canzoniere portoghese della Biblioteca vaticana*, messo a stampa da Ernesto Monaci . . . Halle, 1875.

*Il Canzoniere portoghese Colocci-Brancuti*, pubblicato nelle parti che completano il codice Vaticano 4803, da Enrico Molteni. Halle, 1880.

<sup>4</sup> A. Herculano, *Historia de Portugal*, i, p. 454.

<sup>5</sup> Mrs. Vasconcellos, in: *Grundriss der roman. Philologie*, ii, p. 172.

<sup>6</sup> Herculano, l. c., ii, pp. 70-1.



country ever alluded to by them.<sup>7</sup> It is well-known, however, that a number of the most prominent troubadours visited the neighboring courts of Castile and Leon from which latter kingdom Portugal had sprung.

At the court of Alphonse VII of Leon (1126-1157) we find Marcabrun<sup>8</sup> and Peire d'Alvernha (1157-8)<sup>9</sup>

Alphonse VIII of Castile (1158-1214), celebrated for his liberality, was visited by Aimeric de Pegulhan, Gavaudan, Guilherme de Cabestanh, Guiraut de Bornelh, Guiraut de Calanso, Peire Vidal, Peire Rogier, Rambaut de Vaqueiras, Ramon Vidal, Savaric de Mauleó, Uc de Mataplana and Uc de S. Circ.<sup>10</sup> As one of the five languages which Rambaut de Vaqueiras employed in the descort written between 1195-1202 at the court of Boniface I,<sup>11</sup> was in all probability intended to be Portuguese,<sup>12</sup> he must have been in contact with Gallego-Portuguese poets previous to 1194. Ramon Vidal, again, quotes in one of his poems a few lines which he attributes to a Castilian troubador. As we know that the Castilian trobadores of the time used the Galician dialect for their lyric compositions, and a portion of the passage in question has every appearance of belonging to that idiom, we are justified in assuming that these lines were meant to be Galician rather than Castilian.<sup>13</sup> In connection with several other circumstances to which attention has been called elsewhere,<sup>14</sup> the

7 Excepting Marcabrun and Gavaudan. Cf. Mrs. Vasconcellos, *ibid.*, and Lang, *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis*, p. xxiv.

8 Cf. P. Meyer, *Romania*, vi, p. 123 seq. where Alphonse VIII must be corrected in Alphonse VII; Milá y Fontanals, *Los Trobadores en España*<sup>2</sup>, p. 83.

9 Cf. Milá y Font., *ibid.*, p. 81.—Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c. p. 174) represents Aimeric de Pegulhan as having been at the court of Alphonse VII, but gives no proof for her statement. Nor is there any. A. de Pegulhan flourished between 1205-1270 (cf. Diez, *Leben und Werke der Troubadours*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 342 seq.; Milá y Font., l. c., p. 226), and was present at the battle of Las Navas in 1212. That he composed songs in praise of Alphonse VII (†1157), is therefore highly improbable.

10 Cf. Milá y Font., *ibid.*, pp. 122-132.

11 O. Schultz *Die Briefe des Trobadors Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, pp. 119-120.

12 Cf. Milá y Font., l. c., p. 542; Mrs. Vasconcellos, l. c. p. 173, note 1.

13 Cf. Milá y Font., l. c.; Mrs. Vasconcellos, l. c.

14 *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis*, pp. xxv-xxvii.

occurrence of Portuguese verse in the instances cited seems to show that the beginnings of the Gallego-Portuguese lyric school cannot have been later than 1175.

We know of at least one Gallego-Portuguese poet who was at the court of Alphonse VIII of Castile, and took a prominent part in the battle of Las Navas in 1212, at which most of the troubadours named above were present. This is Rodrigo Diaz de los Cameros,<sup>15</sup> who in the Index Colocci is credited with three poems which have not been preserved to us.

At the court of Alphonse IX of Leon (1188-1230) we find Elias Cairel, Guilherme Ademar, Guiraut de Bornelh, Peire Vidal and Uc de S. Circ.<sup>16</sup> These poets must have exercised a considerable influence on the development of the Gallego-Portuguese court-poetry since they met here a number of Portuguese noblemen, whose poetical compositions have partly been preserved to us. In consequence of the iniquitous policy of Alphonse II of Portugal (1211-1233), D. Gil Sanches, an illegitimate son of Sancho I; D. Gonçalo Mendes de Sousa, with his three brothers D. Garcia Mendes, D. Joam and D. Fernam Garcia, belonging to the most powerful family in Portugal at that time; Abril Peres de Lumiares, Martim Sanches and several others fled to Alphonse IX of Leon, remaining at his court until their reconciliation with the Portuguese king in 1219.<sup>17</sup> Of D. Garcia Mendes D'Eixo, we have (*Canzoniere Colocci-Brancuti*, 347) a poem in Provençal, wherein he expresses the wish of returning to his ancestral home, Sousa.<sup>18</sup> In the refrain of one of the love-songs of D. Fernam Garcia (with the surname Es-garavunha), also of the Sousa family, we find the following two French lines (CB., 227):

15 Cf. Milá y Font., l. c., p. 126.

16 Cf. Milá y Font., l. c., pp. 153-5.—Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c. p. 174, note 5) adds to these Aimeric de Pegulhan and Sordel, without giving any reasons for so doing. Neither Diez (*Leben und Werke*, p. 343) nor Milá y Font., l. c., nor P. Meyer (*Encycl. Brit.*, 9, p. 874) speak of Aimeric as staying at the court of Alphonse IX or of dedicating poems to this king. As to Sordel, he is not known to have been in Spain before 1230, and none of his allusions to the kings of Leon refers, as far as I am aware, to Alphonse IX. (Cf. Schultz, *Zeitschrift für rom. Philol.*, vii, 207-210.)

17 Cf. Herculano, *Hist. de Port.*, ii, 212 seq.; 435, etc.; *Portugaliae Monumenta Historica, Scriptores* i, p. 202.

18 Cf. Mrs. Vasconcellos, l. c., p. 176 note 3.



Or sachiez veroyamen  
Que je soy votr' ome lige.

Ferdinand III of Castile and Leon (1217-1252), whom his son Alphonsè X, represents to us as a great friend of poetry and music,<sup>19</sup> entertained at his court the Provençal troubadours Ademar lo Negre, Elias Cairel, Guilherme Ademar, Guiraut de Bornelh and Sordel,<sup>20</sup> the last one of whom must have been in Leon between 1237 and 1241.<sup>21</sup> That Sordel's songs were especially esteemed and imitated by the Portuguese, we may infer from a direct mention of him—the only occurrence of the name of a Provençal poet in the Portuguese *cancioneiros*—in a poem by D. Joam Soares Coelho, who according to Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c., p. 199, note 5), was a favorite at the peninsular courts, and doubtless met Sordel at that of Ferdinand III of Castile. Other Gallego-Portuguese poets who may, with more or less certainty, be considered as having been the guests of this monarch, are Affons' Eanes de Cotom,<sup>22</sup> Pero da Ponte, who wrote a *planh* on the death of Beatrice of Suabia (†1236), and one on Ferdinand III (†1252),<sup>23</sup> and Bernaldo de Bonaval of whom, according to Alphonse X (*Canzoniere Vatic.*, 70), Pero da Ponte had learned the art of poetry.<sup>24</sup>

A considerable number of Provençal and Gallego-Portuguese poets met at the court of Alphonse X (1252-1284), the most illustrious patron of science and art, and himself one of the foremost lyric poets of the time. To the former belong Aimeric de Belenoi, Arnault Plagues, Bertran Carbonel, Bertran de Lamanon, Bonifaci Calvo, Folquet de Lunel, Guilherme de S. Didier, Guilherme de Monta-

19 Cf. Milá y Font., l. c., pp. 153, 540.

20 Cf. Milá y Font., l. c. p. 154-5; Diez, *Leben u. Werke* 2 p. 113; O. Schultz, *Zeitschrift für rom. Philol.*, vii, p. 210.

21 Cf. O. Schultz, l. c., pp. 207-210.

22 According to a poem by Alphonse X (*Canz. Vat.*, 68), his literary legacy was wrongfully appropriated by Pero da Ponte.

23 *Canz. Vat.*, 573 and 574.

24 Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c., p. 199) says that the Genoese Bonifaci Calvo was knighted by Ferdinand III and that his two Portuguese songs were inspired by his love for Berenguela, the king's niece. There is no authority for this but the unreliable statements of Nostradamus. Cf. in regard to Bonifaci Calvo the investigations of Schultz, l. c., pp. 225-6.

gnagout, Guiraut Riquier and Nat de Mons,<sup>25</sup> to the latter, Affons' Eanes de Cotom, Gil Perez, Conde (CB., 405), Gonçal' Eanes do Vinhal (*Canz. Vat.*, 1008), Joam Vaasquez (CB., 423), Pero Gomes Barroso (*Canz. Vat.*, 1057), Pay Gomes Charinho (*Canz. Vat.*, 1159) Pero da Ponte, Pedramigo de Sevilha (CB., 423), Joham Baveca (*Canz. Vat.*, 827) and Pero Mafaldo (CB., 387).<sup>26</sup>

Very few are the occasions known to us on which the Portuguese must have become acquainted with the lyric poetry of northern France. With the two exceptions mentioned above (c. 208), we have no record of the sojourn of a troubère in Portugal; but a number of Portuguese went to France either for the purpose of studying or for political reasons. Thus in 1211, Prince Fernando fled from his brother Alphonse II (1211-1223) to his aunt, the Countess Mathilde of Flanders, marrying Johanna of Flanders and returning to Portugal in 1226.<sup>27</sup> Domingos Annes Jardo, the chancellor of King Denis, had been educated in

25 Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c., p. 173, note 3) mentions ten more troubadours as having either visited Alphonse X or dedicated poems to him, in regard to most of whom, however, the distinguished Portuguese scholar is in error. Neither the older nor the younger Bertran de Born could have been a contemporary of Alphonse X (cf. Diez, *Leben und Werke*, pp. 148 and 425; Milá y Font., l. c., p. 117). Of the latter we have a *sirventes* relating to John Lackland (Rayn., *Choix*, iv, p. 199) and a *tenso* with Dalfi d'Alvergne (Bartsch, *Grundriss*, 119, 7). Peire Vidal flourished between 1170-1215 (cf. Diez, *Leben u. Werke*, p. 125) and none of his poems refers to Alphonse X (cf. Bartsch, in his edition of Peire Vidal, p. 15). Uc de Escaura was a contemporary of Vidal, whom he addresses in the only poem we possess of him (Rayn., *Choix*, v, p. 220). Paulet de Marselha, as far as is known (cf. Diez, *Leben u. Werke*, p. 473; Milá y Font., l. c., p. 241), did not visit the Castilian court, and among his seven extant poems, none is dedicated to Alphonse, only one ("Ab marrimen"), mentioning him in connection with the imprisonment of Prince Henry. Bartolomé Zorzi, finally, whom Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c., p. 178) represents as having been at the Castilian court in 1269, was in Genoese captivity from 1266-1272. There is, as far as we know, no evidence that he was in Castile at all, nor does any one of his poems more than address in one passage King Alphonse in behalf of his imprisoned brother D. Henrique (cf. O. Schultz, *Zeitschr.* vii, p. 227-8).

26 In my edition of the lyric poetry of Denis, Joam Ayres de Santiago is several times (pp. xxxiii, lxii, cxxxviii note 6) erroneously spoken of as a predecessor of Denis (see, however, *ibid.*, p. xl). In one of his poems (*Canz. Vat.*, 553) he appears to allude to Peter the Cruel of Castile (1350-1369) and to the Portuguese king of the same name.

27 Herculano, *Hist. de Port.*, ii, pp. 142-3.

France and had taken his degree in canonical law in Paris.<sup>28</sup> Students of medicine went to Montpellier.<sup>29</sup> But far more important for our purpose is the fact that in 1238, if not as early as 1229,<sup>30</sup> Alphonse, a brother of Sancho II, went to his aunt Blanca of Castile, then the Queen-Regent of France, marrying in the same year Mathilde, Countess of Boulogne. During his sojourn at the French court, he was joined by a number of Portuguese nobles, who returned with him to Portugal in 1245. Prominent among these were Gomes Viegas, Pedro Ouriques da Nobrega, his son Joham Pires d'Avoym, Estevam Annes de Valladares and Ruy Gomes de Briteyros,<sup>31</sup> the last three of whom are known to us as poets. In the brilliant circles of the court of Blanca of Castile, for whom Guillaume de Lorris had written the celebrated *Roman de la Rose* (1237), Alphonse and his followers must have been profoundly impressed with the literary culture of France, and it is to be supposed that through them many of the conceits and forms of French poetry became known in Portugal. As an instance of such influence may here be cited the *gesta de maldizer* (*Canz. Vat.*, 1080) of the Portuguese Affonso Lopes de Bayam, which is written in the form of the *laissez monorimes* of the *chansons de geste*.

From what has been said it will be seen that, as far we know, the intercourse between the Portuguese and the troubadours and trouvères did not take place in Portugal, but at foreign courts, and that it could, therefore, in most cases be neither intimate nor of long duration. It is owing to this circumstance and the materially different social and intellectual conditions of western Spain, that the Gallego-Portuguese lyric school, though called into life through the example set by the Provençal troubadours, received its most characteristic features not from the latter, but from the national popular poetry then flourishing in Galicia and Portugal.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Moura, p. xv of his *Cancioneiro de D. Diniz*.

<sup>29</sup> The medical school of Montpellier is repeatedly alluded to in the Portuguese poetry of the time; as, for example, *Canz. Vat.*, 1116.

<sup>30</sup> Herculano, l. c. p. 367.

<sup>31</sup> Herculano, l. c., p. 387-8.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Mrs. Vasconcellos, l. c., p. 180.

The almost primitive simplicity of form and feeling which this popular poetry imparted to most of the poetic types adopted by the nascent literary school, the predominating employment of compositions of only three short stanzas in which the expression of the same idea in three synonymous variations is typical,<sup>33</sup> did not allow the Portuguese singers the scope necessary for producing the highly wrought strophic forms or the development of thought of the Provençal canzone. If in addition to this we consider that the ambition of faithful imitation or reproduction was foreign to the medieval author and that the lack of individuality which marks the subject-matter of the great body of the love-poetry of that time, renders it exceedingly difficult and often impossible to trace a conceit occurring in two authors to its real origin, we must be prepared not to find in the Gallego-Portuguese song literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the number of more or less close imitations of Provençal originals which the powerful influence exercised by the poetry of the troubadours on the literature of other nations might lead one to expect, and the existence of which in the courtly lyrics of northern France has been shown by Paul Meyer<sup>34</sup> and A. Jeanroy.<sup>35</sup>

That a more careful examination of the three Portuguese *cancioneiros* now accessible to us, and especially of the narrative and satirical forms contained in them, will nevertheless lead to the discovery of not a few compositions whose Provençal or French original is more or less clearly recognizable, may be inferred from the following few instances.<sup>36</sup>

Immediately after the passage quoted at the beginning of this article, Diez cites part of the following two stanzas of a poem by Martin Soares (*Trovas*, no. 54=CB., 151):

Desta coyta en que me vos teedes  
en que o'eu vivo tam sem sabor,

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, pp. 153, 195; Lang, *Das Liederbuch des Königs Denis*, pp. xlii seq. and cxxxv seq.

<sup>34</sup> *Romania*, xix, pp. 14 seq.

<sup>35</sup> *De Nostratibus medii ævi poetis qui primum lyrica Aquitaniae carmina imitati sint*. Paris, 1889.

<sup>36</sup> A number of such correspondences are pointed out in my edition of the lyrics of King Denis.

que farei eu pois me vos nom creedes?<sup>37</sup>  
 que farey eu cativo pecador?  
 que farey vivendo sempre ssy?  
 que farei eu que mal dia nacy?  
 que farei eu poys me nom valedes?

E poys que des nom quer que me valhades,  
 nem queirades mha coita creer,  
 que farey eu, por des que mh o digades?  
 que farey eu se logo nom moirer?  
 que farei eu se mays a viver ey?  
 que farei eu que conselh 'i nom ey?  
 que farei eu que vos deseparades.

After remarking that these lines recall the following passage of Uc de S. Circ (Rayn., *Choix*, iii, 330):

Que farai ieu, domna, que sai ni lai  
 Non puesc trobar ses vos ren que bo m sia?  
 Que farai ieu, qu'a mi semblon esm i  
 Tug autre joy, si de vos no'ls avia?  
 Que farai ieu, cui capdella e guia  
 La vostr' amors, e m siec e m fug e m pren?  
 Que farai ieu, qu' autre joy non aten?  
 Que farcei ieu, ni cum poirai guandir,  
 Si vos, domna, no m voletz aculhir?

Diez concludes: "Aber die an den Stossseufzer geknüpften Gedanken sind andre, ausser etwa, dass *pois me vos non valedes* dem prov. *si vos no m voletz aculhir* entspricht."

Still, apart from the fact that the tone of the two poems is essentially the same, the regular repetition of the words *que farey* at the beginning of so many lines in both, leaves hardly any doubt that one must have served as a model to the other. This very Martim Soares, who was a contemporary of Uc de S. Circ, and noted as one of the best Portuguese poets,<sup>38</sup> uses the same artifice again (CB., 136), where most of the lines in the first and last stanzas begin with the negative *nem*. In a similar manner, Aimeric de Pegulhan (Rayn., *Choix*, iii, p. 429) begins five lines of the fourth stanza with *ni*. In both cases the poet utters complaints against the cruelty of his lady. The same beginning is found in the first three stanzas of a poem by Peire Cardinal (Rayn., *Choix*, iii, 438-9) who (*ibid*, iv, 341-2) repeats the conjunction *e* in the first two stan-

<sup>37</sup> This line is wanting in CB.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the note above CB., 116; and Lang, l.c., p. xxx.

zas, as does Martim Soares in CB. 131. As these Provençal poets flourished at the time when Martim Soares began his poetical career, we may not be so very wrong in supposing that he met them at one of the peninsular courts where they sojourned.<sup>39</sup> That Peire Cardinal, of whose visit to Leon or Castile we have no record, exercised some influence on the Portuguese poets, is shown by a *sirventes* of Martim Moxa<sup>40</sup> agreeing, as may be seen from the following extracts, in form as well as in subject-matter and expression, pretty closely with a poem by the Provençal troubadour especially celebrated for his satirical songs:

Vej 'avoleza  
 maleza  
 per sa soteleza  
 o mundo tornar.  
 Ja de verdade  
 nem de lealdade  
 nom ouço falar;  
 ca falsidade  
 mentira e maldade  
 nom this dan logar.

Vej 'achegados  
 loados  
 de muitos amados  
 os de mal dizer

Tant es viratz  
 Lo mons en desmezura,  
 Que falsedatz

<sup>39</sup> Cf. also Raimbaut d'Aurenga, Rayn., *Choix*, v, p. 401.

<sup>40</sup> This is his name as regularly given in Colocci's Index (*Canz. Vat.*, p. xxi) as well as over his compositions. Without giving us her reasons, Mrs. Vasconcellos (l.c. p. 190) calls him M. de Moxa and assigns to him the date 1330. In a *cantiga d'escarnho* by Joam de Gaya (*Canz. Vat.*, 1062) we read: Comede migu' e dar-vos-ey cantares de Martin Moxa. The insertion of *de* would violate the metre. In one of his compositions (*Canz. Vat.*, 503), M. Moxa rails at a certain Maestr 'Açenzo, who for selfish purposes joined the king's faction and was interested in the surrender of a fortress. This appears to allude to the struggle between Sancho II and his brother Alphonse and the betrayal of a number of fortified places to the latter, which form the subject of a number of satirical compositions (for example, *Canz. Vat.*, 1088, 1090, 1183; CB., 434). In the absence of any proof to the contrary, it would therefore seem tolerably safe to assign Martim Moxa to the second quarter of the thirteenth century.



Es en luec de drechura,  
 E cobeitatz  
 Creys ades e melhura,  
 E malvestatz  
 Es en luec de valor  
 E pietatz  
 At d'hoste sofrachura,  
 E caritatz  
 Fai del segle clamor,  
 Et es lautzatz  
 Qui de dieu non a cura,  
 E pauc prezatz  
 Qui vol aver s'amor.<sup>41</sup>

Add to this a passage from another poem of Peire Cardinal:

Falsedatz e desmezura  
 An batalha empreza  
 Ab vertat et ab dreitura,  
 E vens la falseza ;  
 E deslialtatz si jura  
 Contra lialeza ;  
 E avaretatz s'atura  
 Encontra largueza.<sup>42</sup>

Both for subject and style, the following French motet (*Romania*, vii, p. 101) bears great resemblance to the passages just cited :

Ne sai ke je die,  
 Tant voi vilonnie  
 Et orgueil et felonnie  
 Monter en haut pris.  
 Toute cort(r) esie  
 S'en est si fuie  
 K'en tout cest siecle n'a mie  
 De bons dis, etc.

A humorous poem in which the same troubadour discards love, begins: Ar mi pues ieu lauzar d'amor.<sup>43</sup> This line opens a love-song of Martin Moxa's, (*Canz. Vat.*, 476), Amor, de vos ben me posso loar, and also the lai of Tristan and Iseu, CB., 1 :

Amor, des que m'a vos cheguey  
 Bem me posso de vos loar.<sup>44</sup>

Many a medieval lyric poet sounds a note of warning and complaint against the false

<sup>41</sup> *Canz. Vat.*, 481; Rayn., *Choix*, iv, 350.

<sup>42</sup> Rayn., *Choix*, iv, 338.

<sup>43</sup> Rayn., *Choix*, iii, 438.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Jeanroy, *Origines de la poésie lyrique en France*, p. 316.

lovers, the *trichador*, *lausengier*, Portuguese *maldizente* (*Canz. Vat.*, 635) or *dizedor* (*Canz. Vat.*, 523)<sup>45</sup>. This theme is treated by the Portuguese Joham Baveca, (*Canz. Vat.* 699):

Os que non amam nem sabem d'amor,  
 fazem perder aos que amor am.  
 Vedes porque: quand 'ant 'as donas vam,  
 Juram que morrem por ellas d'amor ;  
 e elas sabem poys que nom é sy.

E por esto perz 'eu e os que ben  
 lealmente amam segundo meu sen.

E aqueles que ia medo nom am  
 que lhis faza coyta sofrer amor,  
 veen ant 'elas e juram melhor  
 ou tam bem come os que amor am.  
 E elas nom sabem quaes creer

E por esto, etc.

This reminds one of Mathieu de Gand:<sup>46</sup>

Dame, ceus qui sont faus dedens  
 Et blanc dehors, ne creez mie ;  
 Lor parole n'est fors que vens,  
 Car là on cuide cortoisie,  
 N'a à la fois fors trecherie ;  
 Legierement croire est folie,  
 Car teus dira à la foie :  
 " Dame, morir croi por vos eus,"  
 Qui point n'iert d'amors souffraiteus.<sup>47</sup>

Thus Albertet, (Herrig's *Archiv* 34, 375) says :

Li tricheor qi sen fegnent damar  
 Font les leials agran dolor languir  
 E les dames en font mult ablasmar  
 Car amet cels qes gabent al partir  
 Donc sui ie fols qan ie ne sai fausar  
 Ne pois uiuer mon dannaie ni plaigna  
 Douza dame freit glaiues uos estaigna  
 Si me faites de parfot sospirer.

and of Gaucelm Faidit:<sup>48</sup>

Las falsas e'l trichador  
 Fan tan que'l fin preyardor

<sup>45</sup> The meaning "redegewandter, witziger kopf" which Mrs. Vasconcellos (l. c., p. 195) attributes to this word, is not justified by the context of the poem which she cites. *Dizedor* is plainly used in the sense of *maldizente*.

<sup>46</sup> Scheler, *Trouvères belges*. . . Bruxelles, 1876, p. 131.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. also Quenes de Bethune, Scheler, l. c., p. 19; Gilbert de Berneville, Miltzner, *Altfrz. Lieder*, no. xxxi.

<sup>48</sup> Rayn., *Choix*, iii, 296.

An pois dan en lur baratz ;  
 Qu'aital es preysars tornatz  
 Tot per doptansa de lor,  
 Que l'us en l'autre no s fia.<sup>49</sup>

Another favorite subject of medieval love-poetry is the necessity of moderation, of measure, *mesura*, to every true lover, *fis amics*. This doctrine is the burden of two Portuguese poems, one by Joham Ayras de Santiago (*Canz. Vat.*, 541), and the other by King Denis (*Canz. Vat.*, 208). I shall here give the latter, as being the more characteristic :

Pero muito amo, muito nom desejo  
 aver da que amo e quero gram bem,  
 porque eu conheço mui entom e vejo  
 que de aver muito a mim nom me vem  
 tam gram folgança que maior nom seja  
 o seu dano d'ela; [e] quem tal bem deseja,  
 o bem de sa dama em mui pouco tem :

Mais o que nom é e seer pod[e]ria,  
 se fosse assi que a ela vesse  
 bem do meu bem, [é que?] eu desejaria  
 aver o maior que aver podesse.  
 ca pois a nos ambos tiinha<sup>50</sup> proveito  
 tal bem desejado, faria direito,  
 e sandeu seria quem o nom fezesse.

E quem d'outra guisa tal bem [desejar],  
 nom é namorado, mais é sem razom,<sup>51</sup>  
 que sempre trabalh'i por cedo cobrar  
 da que nom servio, o moor galar[dom];  
 asi<sup>52</sup> e de tal amor amo mais de cento,  
 e nom amo ùa de que me contento  
 de seer servidor de boom coraçom ;

Que pois me eu chamo e sôo servidor  
 gram treiçom s[er]ia se minha senhor  
 por meu bem ouvesse mal, ou semrazom.  
 E quantos bem amam, assi o diram.

As will be seen, several passages of this composition accord with parts of a *sirventes* by Guilherme de Montagnagout (Herrig's *Archiv*, xxxiv, pp. 200-1), in the close of which this troubadour praises his patron Alphonse X :

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Bern. de Ventador, *Choix*, iii, 85. Daude de Pradas, *Parnasse occit.*, p. 86.

<sup>50</sup> hi bisuha ] *Canz. Vat.*; viinha], CB.

<sup>51</sup> l.s. from ] *Canz. Vat.*, +] CB.

<sup>52</sup> da hi ] *Canz. Vat.*, dam] CB.

Nuills hom noual ni deu esser presatz  
 si tant qant pot en valor no senten  
 Com deu valer segon qes sa rictatz  
 O sauida nonles mas aunimens  
 Doncs qui ben uol auar ualor ualen  
 Aia enamor son cor es esperanssa  
 Caramors fai far rics faitz dagradanssa  
 Efai uiure home adrechamen  
 E dona ioi etol tot marrimen.

Mas eu non teing que sia enamoratz  
 Cel qad amor uai ab galiamen  
 Car non ama ni deu esser amatz  
 Cel que sidonz prec de nuill faillimen :  
 Camans non deu uoler per nuill talen  
 Faich qasidonz tornes adesonranssa,  
 Camors non es res mas aisso cauanssa  
 So que ama eil uol ben leialmen  
 Eq in qier als lo nom damor desmen.

Pero anc mi nom sobret uoluntatz  
 Tant gieu uolgues nuill faich descouinen  
 Dela bella acui me sui donatz  
 Nim tenria nuill plazer per plazen  
 De ren calieis tornes auilimen  
 Nim poiria perren dar benananssa  
 De so calieis tornes amalestanssa  
 Car fis amics deu gardar perun cen  
 Mais de sidonz qel sieu enantimen.

Mas amans dreitz non es desmesuratz  
 Enans ama amesuradamen  
 Car entrel trop elpauc mesura aiatz  
 Estiers non es mesura so enten  
 Anz notz chascun aman ecar noi men  
 Segur estei e fraigna falsa usansa  
 Qeil fals aman menon la falsa amanssa  
 Car qui dreich sec dieus tot ben li cossen  
 Otart otemps siuals al finimen.

It is more probable, however, that some other Provençal or French poem, not known to us, may have inspired the poem of the Portuguese King.<sup>53</sup>

One of the most original Portuguese poets, D. Joham Garcia de Guilhade, assures the lady of his heart that he prefers to live and further endure his anguish than be relieved of it by death :<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Similar sentiments are expressed by Aimeric de Sarlat, (*Choix*, iii, 386), Jehans le Fontaine de Tournai (Mätzner, *Altfrz. Lieder*, no. xxviii), Gilebert de Berneville (*ibid.*, no. xxxi) and by Italian poets such as Ranieri di Palermo (Nannucci, *Manuale*, i, pp. 51-2, etc.).

<sup>54</sup> *Canz. Vat.*, 36.

Quantos am gram coyta d'amor  
e-no mundo qual oj'eu ey,  
querriam moirer, eu o sey,  
e averiam en sabor,  
Mais mentr' eu vos vir, mha senhor,  
sempre m'eu querria viver  
e atender e atender.<sup>55</sup>

Thibaut de Champagne (éd. Tarbé, 23, 15)  
professes the same sentiment in a strikingly  
similar manner:

Chascuns dist qu'il muert d'amors,  
mais je n'en quies ja morir.  
Miex aim sofrir ma dolors,  
vivre, et atendre, et languir.<sup>56</sup>

Vasco Praga, de Sandim, declares in one of  
his songs, (CB., 73) that none but a madman  
trusts a woman:

E creo que fará mal sen  
Quem nunca gran fiuz 'ouver  
En mesura d'outra molher,

and the same thought is developed in a poem  
by Joham Lopes d'Ulhoa (CB., 294):

Mays foym' ela ben falar e rijr  
E falei-lh' eu e non a ui queixar  
nen se queixou porque a chamey senhor.  
E poys que me vyo muj coitado d'amor,  
prougue-lhi muyt'e non m'ar quis catar.

Should the lines just quoted not have been  
suggested by some such passage as the fol-  
lowing by Quenes de Bethune (Scheler, l. c.,  
p. 19)?

Fous est et gars qui a dame se torne,  
Qu'en lor amor n'a point d'afement:  
Quant la dame se cointoie et atorne,  
C'est por faire son povre ami dolent.

Rodrigu 'Eannes de Vasconcellos, one of  
the earliest Portuguese lyric poets, relates to  
us (CB., 314) a dialogue between himself and  
his lady-love, who, having been put in a con-  
vent, consoles her lover by saying that she is  
a nun only in appearance, not at heart. The  
first stanza, of which the other two are only  
graceful variations, may serve as an illustra-  
tion:

Preguntey hũa don[a] en como vos direy;

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Pae Gomez Charinho, *Canz. Vat.*, 393.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Aubouin de Sezanne, Wackernagel *Altfrz. Lieder*  
*u. Leiche*, no. 12.—Cf. Jeanroy, *Origines*, etc., pp. 318-319.

—Senhor, filhastes orden, e ja por en chorey.  
Ela entom me disse: Eu non vos negarey  
De com' eu filhei ordem, assy deus mi perdom:  
Fez mh a filhar mha madre; mais o que lhe  
farey:

Trager-lh' [ei]eu os panos, mays nom o cora-  
çom.

This is a later variation of the so-called  
nun-song, a sub-species of the woman's song  
which, as Jeanroy points out,<sup>57</sup> was very com-  
mon in the French lyric poetry of the middle  
ages, and of which traces are found in mod-  
ern times. From France, this poetic form  
passed into Italy<sup>58</sup> and, it is to be supposed,  
also into Portugal. If so, the poem in ques-  
tion proves once more that the importation of  
certain kinds of the woman's song from France  
into Portugal did not, as Jeanroy would have  
it,<sup>59</sup> begin with the return of Alphonse, count  
of Boulogne, to his native country in 1245, but  
that it took place as early as the beginning of  
the thirteenth century. Though I know of no  
foreign nun-song which might have served as  
a model to our poem, I have thought it  
proper to call attention to it here, as it is the  
only representative of its kind in the Portu-  
guese cancioneros.<sup>60</sup>

Pedramigo de Sevilha, an Andalusian min-  
strel who, as we have seen (cf. above, c. 212)  
was at the court of Alphonse X, where he  
doubtless became acquainted with Guiraut  
Riquier, is the author of a *pastourelle* in the  
most refined literary form, such as it was culti-  
vated in the courtly poetry of France, of the  
Provence and of Italy.<sup>61</sup> On a pilgrimage to  
Santiago he meets, as he relates to us, the  
most lovely maiden he had ever seen. He  
asks her to accept him as her lover, offering  
her whatever present she might wish. She  
replies that by accepting his gifts, she might  
perhaps be the cause of grief to some other  
woman, who might call her to account for  
having estranged her lover from her. But for  
this fear, she adds, she might not be unwilling

<sup>57</sup> *Origines de la poésie lyrique*, p. 189.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Jeanroy, l. c., p. 191.

<sup>59</sup> L. c., pp. 337 seq.

<sup>60</sup> An allusion to the same subject is, however, made by D.  
Joam de Guylhade, *Canz. Vat.*, 37.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Jeanroy. *Origines*, pp. 129-134, etc.



to accept his attentions. The poet then succeeds in persuading her to yield to his entreaties.

There is a French *pastourelle* which, though in the form of a pure dialogue with the typical

personages characteristic of this class of French poetry, in its train of thought as well as in its issue bears so close a resemblance to the composition of Pedramigo, that I am tempted to suspect him of having known it.

Quand' eu hun dia fuy en Compostella  
en romaria, vi huna pastor  
que poys fuy nado, nunca vi tam bela ;  
nen vi a outra que falasse milhor.  
E demandilhe<sup>62</sup> logo seu amor,  
e fiz por ela esta pastorela.

Dix' eu logo: [Mha] fremosa donzela,  
queredes vos mim por entendedor?  
que vos darey boas toucas d[e] Estela,  
e boas cintas de Rrocamador,  
e d'outras doas a vosso sabor,  
e fremoso pano pera gonella.

E ela disse: Eu nom vos<sup>63</sup> queria  
por entendedor, ca nunca vos vi

se nom agora, nem vos filharia  
doas que sey que nom som pera mi  
Pero cuid' eu se as filhass' assi,  
que tal a no mundo a que pesaria.

E se veess' outra, que lhi diria,  
se me dissesse ca: Per vos perdi  
meu amigu' e doas que me regia?  
Eu nom sey rem que lhi dissess' aly.  
Se non foss 'esto de que me tem'i,  
nom vos dig'ora que o nom faria,

Dix'eu: Pastor, ssedes bem rrazoada  
e pero creede, se vos nom pesar,  
que nom est oj'outra no mundo nada,  
se vos nom sedes que eu sabha amar;  
e por aquesto vos venho rogar  
que eu seja voss' ome esta vegada.

E diss'ela come bem ensinada:  
Por entendedor vos quero filhar,  
e pois for a romaria acabada,  
aqui du sã natural do Sar,  
cuido se me queredes levar,  
ir-m'ey vosqu'e fico vossa pagada.<sup>64</sup>

"Trop volentiers ameroie,  
ancor soie je bergiere,  
se loial ami trovoie."

"he belle, oies ma prière:  
je vos ain pres a d'un mois."

"he biaux Guios, tien toi cois,  
car je conois bien t'amie:  
ne me moke mie."

"Marot, j'ai, se deus me voie,  
toute autre amor mis arriere.  
por toi li mes cuers s'otroie."

"et ke dirait Geneuiere  
ke tu baisas ier trois fois?"

"ce ne fu fors que esbanois.  
douce gorgete polie,  
ne me moke mie."

"Guiot, se je le cuidioie,  
mon chapelet de fouchiere—  
par fine amour te donroie."

"Marot, je t'ain par Saint Piere  
plus ke tot celles d'Artois."

"he, Guiot, se tu m'an crois,  
dont moinrons nos bone vie:  
ne me mocke mie."

"Marot, blanche corroie  
te donroie et aumoniere  
volentiers, se je l'avoie."

"Guiot, ta belle maniere  
ma fait ke t'ains, c'est bien drois."

"Marot, c'est un dous otrois,  
si que mes cuers t'an mercie.  
ne me mocke mie."

"Guiot, laisse dont la proie,  
si alons an la bruiere  
faire ceu c'amors nous proie.  
trop plus bel fait a l'oriere  
de ces pres selons ces bois.  
alons i dont, cuers adrois:  
je sui tous an ta bailie.  
ne me mocke mie."<sup>65</sup>

Jeanroy<sup>66</sup> has already called attention to the

<sup>62</sup> Demandi—demandei. See Cornu, *Grundriss der rom. Philologie*, i, p. 802 note 2.

<sup>63</sup> Nos] *Canz. Vat.*

<sup>64</sup> *Canz. Vat.*, 689.

<sup>65</sup> Bartsch, *Romances et Pastourelles*, pp. 166-7.

<sup>66</sup> *Origines*, p. 329.

striking correspondence between the following refrain occurring in a song of D. Joham de Guylhade (*Canz. Vat.*, 30):

Os olhos verdes que eu vi,  
me fazem ora andar assi,

and one in the Châtelain de Saint-Gilles:

En regardant m'ont si vair oïl  
doné les maus dont je me dueil.

A similar correspondence exists between the refrain, *Canz. Vat.*, 1062:

Vos avede-los olhos verdes,  
e matar-m'edes con eles,

and a refrain in Raynaud, *Motets*, i, 75:

Quar bien croi que je morrai  
Quant si vair oel traï m'ont.<sup>67</sup>

The same poet, who treats the heroines of his woman's songs in a way entirely his own, represents one of his maidens as uttering a complaint over the decline of love and poetry in Portugal. As is well known, this was a favorite theme with the courtly poets of the thirteenth century (*Canz. Vat.*, 370):

Ay amigas, perdud' an conhocer  
quantos trobadores no reyno son  
de Portugal; ja nom am coraçom  
de dizer bem que soyam dizer,  
e sol nom falam em amor,  
e al fazem de que m'ar é peor:  
nom querem ja loar bom parecer.

Eles, amigas, perderom sabor  
de vos veeren; ar direy vos al:  
Os trobadores ja vam pera mal:  
nom ha i tal que ja servha senhor  
nem sol trobe per hũa molher.  
Maldita seja quem nunca disser  
a quem nom troba que é trobador.

Mais, amigas, conselho a d'aver  
dona que prez e parecer amar;  
atender temp' e nom se queixar,  
e leixar ja a vo-lo tempo perder.  
ca ben cuyd'eu que çedo verrá alguem  
que se paga da que parece bem,  
e veeredes ced' amor valer.

E os que ja deseparados som  
de nos servir, sabud' é quaes som;

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Jeanroy, l. c.

leixe os dès maa mor[te] prender.<sup>68</sup>

The main idea of this composition may have derived from some such passage as the following.

Thibaut de Champagne (Tarbé, 98):

Philippe, je vous demant  
Ce qu'est devenue amors.  
En cest país ne aillors  
Ne fait nus d'amer semblant,  
Trop me mervoïl durement  
Quant ele demeure ainsi.

J'ai ot  
Des dames grant plaint  
Et Chevaliers en font maint.

Quenes de Bethune (Scheler i, p. 18):

Ja fu tels jors que les dames amaïent  
De leal cuer sans faindre et sans fausser,  
Et chevalier large qui tout donnaient  
Por pris et los et par amors amer;  
Mais or sont il eschar, chiche et aver,  
Et les dames qui cortoisies estoient,  
Ont tot laissié por apenre à borser;  
Morte est amors et mort cil amoient.

Again, the complaint expressed at the end of the first stanza of D. Joam de Guylhade, that the appreciation and praise of feminine beauty had departed from the world, a complaint to which the same poet devotes a whole cantiga d'amigo, was in all probability suggested by a doubtless familiar French refrain (Bartsch, *Romances et Pastourelles*, 10):

Tout li amorous se sont endormi:  
Je suis belle et blonde, si n'ai point d'ami.  
And if our poet ends by wishing evil to those who have turned away from love, this may not have been without thinking of one of a number of French refrains expressing the same sentiment, such as (Bartsch, l. c., p. 200.)

Margueron, honie soit  
Qui de bien amer recroit.<sup>69</sup>

The first stanza of a *pastourelle* by D. Joam d'Aboym bears so striking a resemblance to one by Guiraut de Bornelh as to lead one to

<sup>68</sup> Similar literary variations of the traditional type of the woman's song are found in John Gower's ballads (Stengel, *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, vol. lxxv, pp. 14-5).

<sup>69</sup> Similar refrains are given by Jeanroy, *Origines, etc.*, p. 395; and G. Paris, *Origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge*, p. 55.

suspect imitation on the part of the Portuguese poet. Like his Provençal predecessor, he tells us that while journeying one day, he was attracted by the song of three maidens who were lamenting over the decline of true love<sup>70</sup> (*Canz. Vat.*, 278):

Cavalgaua noutro dia  
per hun caminho frances,  
e huna pastor siia<sup>71</sup>  
cantando con outras tres  
pastores, e non vos pes,  
e direy-vos toda uya  
o que a pastor dizia  
aas outra[s] en castigo:  
nunca molher crea per amigo,  
poys ss'o meu foy e non falou migo.

(Mahn, *Werke*, i, 206):

Lo douz chans d'un auzelh  
Que chantav'en un plays  
Me desviet l'autr'ier  
De mon camin, e m trays.  
E justa 'l plaissaditz,  
On fon l'auzels petitz,  
Planhion en un tropel  
Tres tozas en chantan  
La desmezur' e'l dan  
Qu'an pres joys e solatz.

One of the essential qualities of a true lover is reticence. He must not let anyone know who the lady of his heart is. This principle is the subject of a number of Portuguese songs. Thus Fernam Gonçalves de Seabra says (CB. 337):

Muitos vej 'eu que con mengua de sen  
am gram sabor de me dizer pesar;  
e todo-los que me veen preguntar:  
qual est a dona que eu quero ben,  
vedes que sandec' e que gram loucura:  
nen catam deus nen ar catam mesura,  
nen catam mi a quen pesa<sup>72</sup> muit 'en.  
Nen ar catam como perden seu sen  
os que m' assy cuidam a enganar,  
e [que] non o podem adevjnhar.  
Mais o sandeu quer diga mal quer ben,  
e o cordo dirá sempre cordura:  
des y eu passarey per mha ventura,  
mais mha senhor non saberam per ren, etc.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Jeanroy, *ibid.*, p. 133.

<sup>71</sup> *Canz. Vat.*,] sua.

<sup>72</sup> Queor pela] CB., qnõ pesa] CV.

This recalls a stanza of Arnaut de Maruel (Mahn, *Werke*, i, p. 158):

Aitan se pert qui cuia plazers dire  
Ni lausengas per mon cor devinar,  
Qu' atressi ben e mielhs m'en sai defendre,  
Qu 'ieu sai mentir e remanc vertadiers:  
Tal ver y a qu' es fals e messongiers;  
Car qui dis so per qu' amor avilzis,  
Vas si dons ment e si mezeis trahis.

Martim Soares expresses himself in a way which reminds one of a passage in Thibaut de Champagne (CB. 133):

Muitos me veem preguntar.  
mha senhor, a quem quero bem,  
e nom lhis quer' end 'eu falar  
con medo de vos pesar em,  
nem quer' a verdade dizer,  
mais juro e faço-lhis creer  
mentira por vo-lhis negar.  
E por que me veem coitar  
do que lhis nom direi por rem,  
ca m'atrev' en vos amar;  
e mentr' en nom perder o sem,  
nom vos en devedes a temer,  
ca o nom pod' ome saber  
por mim se nom adevinhar.  
E se por ventura assi for  
que m'er pregunten des aqui  
se sodes vos a mha senhor  
que am' e que sempre servj:  
vedes como lhis mentirei:  
d'outra senhor me lhis farei  
ond 'aia mais pouco pavor.<sup>73</sup>

Thibaut de Champagne (Tarbé, p. 45):

Aucuns i a, qui me suelent blamer  
Quant je ne di à qui je suis amis,  
Mais ja, Dame, ne saura mon penser  
Nus, qui soit nés, fors vous qui je le dis  
Couardement, à pavours, à doutance:  
Dont puestes vous lors bien à ma semblance  
Mon cuer savoir.

The last stanza of the Portuguese piece may be compared with one of Uc de Brunet (*Choix*, iii, p. 317), where the poet also says that in order to conceal his true love, he will pretend to love another:

Ja lausengier no l'en fasson duptansa,

<sup>73</sup> The same beginning and general train of thought is found in a composition by Pero d'Armea (*Canz. Vat.*, 677).



Qu'ieu n'ai vas els pres engienh et albire,  
 Qu'ieu bais los hielhs, et ab lo cor remire,  
 Et en aissi cel lur nia benenansa,  
 Que nulhs no sap de mon cor vas ont es,  
 Ans qui m'enquier de cui se fenh mos chans,  
 Als plus privatx estau quetz'e celans,  
 Mas que lor fenh de so que vers non es.

The leading thought of a poem by D. Joam d'Aboym (*Canz. Vat.*, 279), the trusty Chancellor of Alphonse III, and one of the partisans of this prince during his sojourn in France, is contained in the refrain:

Nom sabem tanto que possam saber  
 qual est a dona que mi faz morrer.

This answers to a doubtless popular French refrain occurring in Baudouin de Condé (éd. A. Scheler, v. 2991):

Ja par moi n'iert noumée  
 Cele cui j'ai amée.

In a cantiga d'amigo by Joam Lopez de Ulhoa (*Canz. Vat.*, 300), a maiden laments having lost her lover through her obduracy and resolves to comply with his wishes if he return:

Ja eu sempre mentre uyua  
 for, uiuerey mui coytada  
 por que se foy meu amigo  
 e fui eu hy muit' errada,<sup>74</sup>  
 por quanto lhi foy sanhuda  
 quando se de mi partia.  
 Par deus, se ora<sup>75</sup> chegasse,  
 co el muy leda seria.  
 E tenho que lhi fiz torto  
 de me lh' assanhar doado  
 pois que mh o nom merecéra,<sup>76</sup>  
 e foy-sse por en coitado;  
 por quanto lhi fui sanhuda, etc.

El de pran que esto cuyda  
 que está<sup>77</sup> migo perdudo;  
 ca se non, logo verria;  
 mais por esto m' é<sup>78</sup> sanhudo,<sup>79</sup>

<sup>74</sup> *Canz. Vat.*] mui cerrada.

<sup>75</sup> *Canz. Vat.*] se ora se ora.

<sup>76</sup> *Canz. Vat.*] m'cera.

<sup>77</sup> *Canz. Vat.*] est.

<sup>78</sup> *Canz. Vat.*] estome.

<sup>79</sup> It will be noticed that in this poem the trochaic catalectic tetrameter is broken into two short lines, a form occurring about thirty times in our cancioneros, and, as is well known, common in the Cantigas de Santa Maria of Alphonse X.

por quanto lhi fui sanhuda, etc.

The subject of this song, especially in the refrain, reminds one very strongly of an Old-French chanson de femme, of which the first two stanzas will be given here:<sup>80</sup>

Lasse, por quoi refusai  
 celui qui tant m'a amée?  
 Long tens a a moi musé  
 et n'i a merci trouvée.  
 Lasse, si très dur cuer ai!  
 Qu'en dirai?  
 Forsenée  
 fui, plus que desvée  
 quant le refusai.

*G'en ferai  
 droit a son plesir,  
 s'il m'en daigne oïr.*

Certes, bien me doi clamer  
 et lasse et maleürée  
 quant cil ou n'a point d'amer  
 fors grant doucor et rosée  
 tant doucement me pria  
 et n'i a  
 recouvrée  
 merci: forsenée  
 fui quant ne l'amai.

*G'en ferai, etc.*

D. Affonso Sanches, a natural son of King Dionysius, sings (*Canz. Vat.*, 17):

Muytos me dizem que servi doado  
 huna donzela que ey por senhor.  
 Dize-lo podem, mais, a Deus loado,  
 poss'eu fazer quen quiser sabedor  
 que non é ssi, ca, se me venha ben,  
 non é doado pois me deu por en  
 muy grand' affam e deseje cuidado.

The idea here expressed that suffering is the reward of love, is a favorite theme of the Provençal troubadours. Thus Richard de Berbezill (Mahn, *Werke*, iii, p. 36) says:

Qu' Oviditz ditz en un libre, e no i men,  
 Que per sofrir a hom d'amor son grat.

And Perdigon (Rayn., *Choix*, iii, p. 344):

Ben aiol mal e l'afan el cossir  
 Qu'ieu ai sufert longamen per amor,  
 Quar mil aitans m'en an mais de sabor  
 li ben qu'amors mi fai aras sentir.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>80</sup> Published by Jeanroy, *Origines, etc.*, p. 502, no. xxi.

<sup>81</sup> Bartsch, *Romances et pastourelles*, iii, 33.

The same Portuguese troubadour represents the beauty of his lady to be such that if any one met her in the inferno, the joy of seeing her would make him forget all his sufferings (*Canz. Vat.*, 22):

Sabedor

soo d'atanto, par Nostro Senhor,  
que s' ela uir e o seu bem parecer,  
coita nen mal outro non poss'auer  
e-no inferno se con ela for;  
desy sey que os que jazem alá,  
nenhu[u] delles ia mal non sentirá,  
tant 'aueram de a catar sabor.

The same image, only with more minuteness, had before D. Affonso Sanches been employed by a French poet, Gautier d'Espinaus (*Herrig's Archiv*, xliii, 299):

Je seux ensi con cil ki est ou feu,  
ou les armes sen uont por espurgier,  
Ki airt toz uis et si ne sent dolor,  
por la grant ioie kil en atent du ciel.  
Por moi lo di ien souffre grant tristor,  
Kensi pens ieu a sa tres fine amour,  
Ke iai tous mals oblieis.  
ie ne me plaing pais des mals.  
si mont greueit  
por la grant ioie ou ie bei.

D. Fernam Paez, of Tamalancos in Galicia, takes leave of his lady, reproaching her with indifference and faithlessness (*Canz. CB.*, 48):

Con vossa graça, mha senhor  
fremosa, ca me quer' eu ir;  
e venho me vos espedir  
por que me fostes traedor.  
Ca avendo-mi vos desamor  
hu vos amey sempr' a seruir,  
des que uos ui, e des enton  
m'ouuestes mal no coração.

In very much the same manner, a Provençal troubadour sings (Appel, *Provenz. Inedita*, p. 294):

Tan fuy enves ma dona fis  
que fina la trobei, senhors;  
mas ara falh, sim brunezis,  
per quieu m'en vau mudan alhors.

H. R. LANG.

Yale University.

# MUTATION OF GENDER IN THE CA- NADIAN-FRENCH DIALECT OF QUEBEC.

As a slight contribution to the literature of gender-mutation, the following notes of examples occurring in the French dialect of Quebec may be of interest.

In assigning a gender to some of the words he has borrowed from the Indian, the French Canadian halts between two opinions. Among the words of this class whose gender seems to vacillate are:

1. *Nigog*, or *nigogue*, a fish-spear. The word is in common use in the Acadian Gulf Region. Ferland (*Foyer Canad.*, 1865, p. 264), Taché (*Forestiers et Voyageurs*, p. 79), Le Moine (*Chasse et Pêche*, p. 258) make the word, whether spelt *nigog* or *nigogue*, masculine, but J. G. Barthe (*Souvenirs*, p. 118) has "La pêche au saumon au flambeau et avec la *nigogue*."
2. *Mocassiu*. Dunn (*Glossaire Franco-Canadien*, s. v.), Marmette (*François de Bienville*, p. 263), Bourassa (*Jacques et Marie*, p. 91) and many others write the word as *mocassin* and make it of the masculine gender. Louis Fréchette (*Fleurs Boréales*, p. 44) uses this form also, but in the *Soirées Canadiennes* (1861, p. 177), we find "la légère *mocassine*," a spelling and gender known also from Chateaubriand.
3. *Tobogane*. Of this word the following forms with feminine gender are met with: *tobogaue* (Dunn); *tabagane* (Ferland, *Hist. du Canada*, p. 113); *tabaganne* (Leclercq, *Relation de la Gaspésie*, 1691, p. 70); *Tabogine* (Lemoine, *Monographies et Esquisses*, p. 70). The masculine forms are: *tobagan*; *tobogan*.
4. *Wananish*, a trout found in Lake St. John. This word is spelt *oualamiche*, *walamiche*, *wananiche*, *wananish*, *wawanish*, *ouinaniche*, *winnoniche*, etc. The masculine gender is assigned it by Buies (*Le Saguenay*, p. 203), Lemoine (*Chasse et Pêche*, p. 26), but in the *Naturaliste Canadien* (Vol. viii, p. 77), the word is made feminine.

Dunn notes the use of *argent* and *bol* as feminine, and of *dinde* as masculine. There seems to be a decided tendency to *femininize*.

Buies speaks of the *habitant's* love for this gender in the following terms:

"Et que dire du féminin! Oh! le féminin, quel rôle immense il joue chez le peuple canadien, évidemment le peuple le plus galant de l'univers! Non seulement il nous empoigne par les fibres les plus intimes de notre être, mais il nous empoigne encore par la langue dans presque tout ce que nous disons, et par les doigts à chaque mot que nous écrivons. C'est comme de la virgule; on en est envahi, entortillé, enlacé. . . . Il paraît qu'il n'y a pas de remède à cette déman-gaison de la virgule. C'est aussi invétéré que 'une belle hôtel, de la bonne argent, une grande escalier, une grosse oreiller, une large intervalle, une bonne appétit, une bonne estomac, la grande air, une grande espace, . . . etc., . . . Je pourrais en citer comme cela des mille et des mille sans jamais arriver au fond de cet abîme d'amour du féminin qui, combiné avec celui de la virgule mal placée, nous expose aux déconvenues les plus grotesques auprès des jolies femmes instruites qui ne tolèrent pas de se voir mises au même genre qu'un escalier, ou un oreiller."

Lusignan<sup>2</sup> records the following instances of the *feminine* substituted for the *masculine*:

1. *Ballustre*. "Un Journal sérieux raconte un miracle. Une paralytique . . . . . laisse ses béquilles aux pieds de la *ballustre* (p. 22)."
2. *Chlorure*. "Que de gens demandent à tort de la *chlorure* à leur pharmacien!" (p. 47).
3. *Comices*. "*Comices* est du masculin. On écrit donc à tort les *comices municipales*, ainsi que je l'ai lu dans un journal de la campagne" (p. 138).
4. *Décombres*. "Le journal d'Ottawa qui a dit 'des *décombres sociales, religieuses et morales*' a fait une grosse faute, *décombres* étant du masculin" (p. 100).
- 5-13. *Episode*, etc. "*Episode* se rencontre quelquefois au féminin dans les journaux. Il est masculin, de même que les mots suivants, presque toujours féminisés par le peuple: *escalier, oreiller, espace, intervalle, argent, emplâtre, éventail, incendie*" (p. 100).
14. *Esclandre*. "*Esclandre* a été du féminin, nous dit Littré; et des écrivains

<sup>1</sup> *Anglicismes et Canadienismes*, Québec, 1888, pp. 14-15.

<sup>2</sup> *Fautes à Corriger*. Une chaque jour. Québec, 1890. xxvi, 179 pp.

contemporains, Scribe et Soulié entre autres, l'ont fait de ce genre. Mais la règle est admise qu'il est aujourd'hui du masculin, conformons-nous-y" (p. 133).

15. *Insigne*. "Un journal annonce que 'les camarades du général B. lui ont présenté une *insigne* de la légion d'honneur', et que '*cette insigne est faite de diamants*,' Comme d'autres journaux partagent son erreur et font *insigne* du féminin, je tiens à les détromper" (p. 98).

Concerning mutations from feminine to masculine Buies says:

"En revanches et comme manière de compensation (une légère infidélité) il y a certains mots féminins que l'on trouve invariablement écrits au masculin dans nos journaux. Ainsi, par exemple, de *panacée*, s. f. qu'il est impossible de voir employé autrement qu'au masculin, et écrit *panacé*. Ainsi encore d'*atmosphère* que l'on met presque toujours au masculin, sans doute pour se venger d'*intervalle*, et d'*espace* qui persistent à rester masculins avec une forme féminine" (p. 16).

Lusignan cites the following feminines often found in the masculine:

1. *Atmosphère*. "Il y a un mot dont l'usage est si fréquent que je ne comprends pas que des journalistes ignorent son genre; c'est le mot *atmosphère*. Nous disons ou entendons dire tous les jours que l'*atmosphère* est *bas, pesant, vicié*, tandis qu'il faudrait mettre ces adjectifs au féminin" (pp. 50-51).
2. *Circulaire*. "*Circulaire* est du féminin; la plupart des marchands et des commis le font cependant du masculin" (p. 149).
3. *Cretonne*. "La *cretonne* est une toile qui a la chaîne de chanvre et la trame de lin; elle est fort connue et employée au Canada, mais on a le tort assez général de la faire du genre masculin et de dire *du cretonne*" (pp. 111-112).
4. *Crique*. "On a tort d'appeler un ruisseau un *crique*. En fait d'eau, *crique* ne signifie pas autre chose qu'une petite baie, une petite anse dans les anfractuosités du rivage. Ce mot est du genre féminin" (p. 62).
5. *Offre*. "On a le tort assez général de faire *offre* du genre masculin; on doit



pourtant dire et écrire : on m'a fait *une belle offre, une offre avantagense*" (p. 66).

- 6-7. *Sud-Amérique. Nord-Amérique*. "Dites *la* et non *le* Sud-Amérique, Nord-Amérique : le genre de l'article est imposé par celui du continent et non par celui du point cardinal" (p. 139).
8. *Tarière*. "J'ai lu je ne sais plus dans quel journal l'annonce d'un feronnier commençant ainsi : A l'enseigne *du gros tarière*. Il aurait fallu *de la grosse tarière*. *Tarière* est féminin, et sa première syllable s'écrit sans *r*" (pp. 59-60).
9. *Tondre*. "Il n'y a pas cent personnes dans le pays qui dirait : 'J'ai allumé ma pipe avec *de la tondre*.' Tout le monde dit *du tondre*, et tout le monde a tort. *Tondre* est féminin" (p. 7).

In the word-lists given by Prof. Geddes in his study of Acadian dialects occur a number of cases of gender-mutation which are here presented, arranged under appropriate heads.

- I. Masculine for feminine : *gage* (452).
- II. Feminine for masculine : *âge* (456), *argent* (451), *automne* (10), *enterrement* (9), *escalier* (452), *espace* (457), *étage* (452), *hiver* (10), *orage* (453), *poison* (101).

An interesting study upon which the present writer has been for some time engaged is that of the French Element in the "Chinook Jargon" or "Oregon Trade Language." Even here the tendency to feminization is discernible, as the following curious word given by Mr. Hale in his *Manual of the Oregon Trade Language* (London, 1890), shows :

"*Latla*, French [latlá], noise (French *faire du train*, to make a noise)," p. 47.

On the other hand we find :

"*Lebal*, French [libál], ball, bullet" (p. 47), which associates itself with the borrowed masculines in *le* (*li*)—also "*lepome* [lipóm], apple" (p. 47); "*lemah* [limà], hand" (p. 47); *lemel*, mule (p. 58). *Lepome* and *lemah* may, possibly, be plurals, however.

Sufficient has been noted here to indicate the frequency of gender-mutation and to suggest the need of making this a special point of

3 "Two Acadian French Dialects Compared with the Dialect of Ste. Anne de Beaupré," i, MOD. LANG. NOTES vol. viii, 449-459; ii, vol. ix, 1-11; iii, vol. ix, 99-115.

inquiry in the investigation of Canadian-French dialects.

A. F. CHAMBERLAIN.

Clark University.

### SOME NEW NOTES ON SIDNEY'S POEMS.

RAWLINSON MS., Poetic 85 is known to editors of early Elizabethan poetry as the most authentic source of some of Sidney's, Oxford's, Breton's, and others' poems, as well as of nearly all of Edward Dyer's, but by some oversight editors using it have passed unnoticed some poems which undoubtedly (so far as the authenticity of any Elizabethan poems is undoubted), belong to Sidney, though unsigned or signed by other persons. These copies give interesting if not important new readings. The editors have also passed by the first two stanzas of a pretty lyric which on the authority of this manuscript is included in Sidney's works. Besides these there are a number of unsigned poems, most of which I have not succeeded in tracing to any author or other collection. Many of these are of considerable beauty and quite worth being rescued from their oblivion, but the treatment of these waifs is somewhat outside the object of this paper.

The date of the manuscript is a most important matter in deciding the value of its text. The catalogue of the Rawlinson MSS. says, "written late in the sixteenth century." This is scarcely so definite as I could wish, but I am not able after some study to be very much more so, at least not conclusively. The well-known fact that poems circulated widely in manuscript form for years before they saw print, complicates the matter. One must start with the ever-present guard that these may have been copied from the manuscript poems circulated among the authors' friends, or, in equal likelihood, from the later printed works.

This manuscript is one of those neatly-written private anthologies common at that time, of which a number are preserved. Two things are to be noticed about this one; first, that the style of writing, color of ink, and general appearance are practically uniform all through the two hundred and fifty pages. This makes

it probable that no long time elapsed between the writing of the first and last pages. The second is, that almost all of the writers represented belong to the so-called "court school." They are Sidney, Dyer, Greville, Oxford, Breton, Raleigh, Spenser and others of the Areopagus ilk. This gives color to the belief that the owner of the book was in touch with this school. These men did most of their work between 1578 and 1594. I am strongly inclined to put the date of the manuscript at 1590 or soon after.

Another point to be noticed in the book is that each poem (except a few fragments in the latter part, apparently attempts of the owner) has at the end "finis," the author's name if it is signed, and some fancy penwork-flourishes. This seems to show that the writer used much care, and that therefore mistakes in signatures are not due to his haste but to mistakes in his original. It seems also to make the use of manuscript originals probable, for, had he copied from a volume of a poet's works, he would scarcely have written another poet's name under the copies. The numerous text differences support this theory. All this leads to the probability that he wrote before the sudden outpouring of the printed works of his poets which began in the early years of the '90's. This is my strongest reason for placing it in 1590.

Perhaps it would be best here, before entering into the relation of the manuscript to Sidney's poems, to run over the dates of his works. He wrote the greater part in the years adjacent to 1580. He died in 1586. The first quarto of the *Arcadia* (1590) is supposed to be his earliest appearance in print; but, in fact, I have recently found two of the *Astrophel and Stella* songs, the Sixth and the Tenth, set to music and published in William Byrd's song-books, *Psalms, Sonets and Songs*, 1588, and *Songs of Sundrie Natures*, 1589. The *Astrophel and Stella* appeared in 1591 when it went through at least two editions. In 1598 Sidney's sister, the Countess of Pembroke, edited all his main works (except translations), adding some hitherto unpublished poems under the title of *Certaine Sonets*. This folio text is the basis of most later editions.

There are twenty-two of Sidney's poems in

this Rawlinson manuscript, if we accept as his all those included in Dr. Grosart's edition, which is the only collected edition. Of these twenty-two, fourteen are signed with Sidney's full name or initials. Five are unsigned, two have mistaken signatures, one has "Incertus author." It is not improbable that some others in the book are Sidney's, but no one of them is so strikingly in his vein that I feel justified in attributing it to him.

Eight of the Sidney poems are from the *Arcadia*, nine are from the *Certain Sonets* of the 1598 folio, two are included in Dr. Grosart's collection solely on the authority of this manuscript, and the remaining three are from the songs of the Stella cycle.

The remarkable fact at once strikes one that there are none of the Stella sonnets. The author of the manuscript apparently liked sonnets. He has copied a number of them. He has pretty good taste too. The only conclusion is that he did not have access to the Stella cycle, that it was unknown to him. Yet he seems to have known the songs which are printed among the sonnets for he has copied three of them. Does this imply that the songs were known and circulated in MS. form separately from the sonnets? If so, this may throw light upon the reason why the songs were printed in group after the sonnets in the '91 quarto, but in the '98 folio were scattered among the sonnets in the Italian fashion. It is not unreasonable to believe that these eleven songs were first as a whole connected with the sonnets by the editor of the First quarto, who getting hold of the cycle in manuscript form, hunted up such other of Sidney's poems, that had not appeared in the *Arcadia* of the previous year, as he could find, and added them as a supplement (which was followed by another set by other poets); that the Countess of Pembroke, remembering her brother's admiration for Italian models, arranged them among the sonnets. Support is given to this conjecture by the fact that four of the songs have apparently no stronger vital connection with the sonnets than some other songs which were printed in the *Certaine Sonets*. (Those which Dr. Grosart collects under the title of "Sidera" in Vol. ii. of his 1877 edition, and which Mr. Pollard adds to his fine edition of

the *Astrophel and Stella*, 1888).

The absence of any of the copyist's usual marks of termination after two stanzas at the bottom of fol. 25<sup>b</sup> caused me to notice that the two are really part of the poem which occupies the following page (fol. 26). In form and matter the two parts are identical and there is no doubt that they belong together. The poem, which is signed "S.P.S." on fol. 26 was first published in Wood's *Athenae Oxoniensis* in 1691-2, and was taken from this MS., but began with the stanza at the top of fol. 26, omitting the first two, by over-sight, I suppose. Dr. Grosart in his edition followed Wood instead of referring to the source, so it happens that these two stanzas have never been published in Sidney's works. The poem, which may be found in Bliss's *Wood's Athenae Oxon.*, Vol. i., p. 525, and Grosart ed. of Sidney, Vol. ii., p. 37, is as follows (with the two stanzas, the first and second, in place).

At my harte there is a paine,  
Never payne so pinchte my harte,  
More than halfe with sorrow slayne,  
And the payne yet will not parte.

AlI, my harte, how it doth bleede  
Into dropps of bitter teares.  
Whyle my faythfull love doth feede,  
But one fancy onely feares.

Ah poore Love whi dost thou live,  
Thus to se thy service lost?  
If she will no comforte geve,  
Make an end, yeald up the goaste;  
That she may at lengthe approve  
That she hardlye long beleved  
That the harte will dye for love  
That is not in tyme relieved.

Ohe that ever I was borne,  
Service so to be refused,

"All my senses stand amazed  
While mine eyes too long have gazed  
On a faire and heavenlic creature  
Half an angell for her feature."

(First stanza of no. 26, p. 22, section t, Vol. i., of Gros. ed. of Breton).

"Blind alas it is no wonder  
Bewtie breaks the sight asunder,  
Never hart that once dyd eye her  
But was feareful to come nye her."

(In No. 26, p. 22, sect. t, Vol. i., Gros. ed. Breton).

Faythfull love to be foreborne!  
Never love was to abused.

But swet Love, be still a whylle;  
She that hurte thee, Love maye healle thee;  
Sweet, I see within her smylle  
More than reason can reveale thee.

For, though she be riche and fayre,  
Yet she is bothe wise and kynde,  
And therefore do thou not despayre,  
But thy faythe may fancy fynde,

But curiously enough, Dr. Grosart himself has printed the whole poem, just as I have given it, in the works of another author. In his elaborate edition of Nicholas Breton's Works, (Chertsey Worthy Library), Vol. i, section t, page 18, no. 16, it occurs, being placed there on the authority of a manuscript lately in the possession of a Mr. Cosens of London. I gather from Dr. Grosart's account of the manuscript that the first thirty poems in it are signed N. B., but that the rest are unsigned, and that this poem is in the latter class. Dr. Grosart, on the authority of propinquity I presume, has swept these unsigned poems into the drag-net of Breton's works. I myself am convinced on grounds of internal evidence, that some others of these unsigned poems are Sidney's, for there are certain intangible delicacies of phrasing and cadence peculiarly Sidneian, which I have never found anywhere outside of Sidney's recognized poems except in a few of these. Examples are his constant use of the feminine rime, and trochaic meter in songs, thus giving them a ringing, singing verve. Except in these doubtful ones (and in another set of doubtful ones of which I will speak later), Breton does not use these modes or at least uses them very rarely. But a few extracts will be more to the point.

"All my sense thy sweetnes gainéd  
Thy faire haire my heart enchainéd  
My poore reason thy words movéd  
So that thee like heaven I lovéd."

(First stanza of no. xx, p. 63, Vol. ii. of Gros. ed. of Sidney).

Have I caught my heav'nly jewell  
Teaching Sleepe most faire to be,  
Now will I teach her that she  
When she wakes is too . . . too cruel.

(Second song, Vol. i., p. 155 of Gros. ed. of Sidney).



Another poem in this section (No. 22, page 20) bears a noticeable similarity of thought to the six sonnets of the Stella cycle which are best entitled "How to write sonnets" (Nos. i.,

iii., vi., xv., xix., xxviii.). The whole would be too long to quote here, but I subjoin the first three stanzas of the supposed Breton poem and a few lines from the sonnets.

"Some men will say there is a kind of muse  
That helps the mind of each man to endite  
And some will saie (that many Muses use)  
There are but nyne that ever usde to wryte.  
Nowe of these nyne if I have gotten one,  
I muse what Muse it is I hitt upon.

Some poets write there is a certain hill,  
Where Pallas keeps, and that Parnassus hight.  
There muses sitt forsooth, and cut the quill  
That being framde doth hidden fancyes write  
But all those dames do heavenly causes singe  
And all their pennens are of a Phoenix winge.

But as for me I never sawe the place  
Except in sleepe I dreame of such a thinge.  
I never viewde dame Pallas in her face,  
Nor ever yet could hear the muses singe,  
Wherby to frame a fauncy in such kinde,  
Oh no, my muse is of another mynde."

"Let daintie wits  
crie on the  
Sisters nine"  
(III)

"Some lovers speake  
when they their  
Muses entertain"  
(VI)

"You that do search  
for everie purl-  
ing spring  
which from the ribs  
of old Parnassus  
flowes."  
(XV)

"For me, in sooth,  
no Muse but  
one I know."  
(III)

I am strengthened in this conviction of the Sidney authorship of these unsigned poems, by similar cases in another selection of Dr. Grosart's edition of Breton. The section is a reprint of *An Arbor of Amorous Devices*, a miscellany of 1597, bearing the initials "N.B." on the title page, of which book the only extant copy is in the Capell collection of the Trinity College Library at Cambridge. One poem which Dr. Grosart reprints is undoubtedly Sidney's. It is the Arcadia poem, "The fire to sea my wrongs for anger turneth" (Gros. ed. Sidney, Vol. ii., p. 247; 1598 *Arcadia*, p. 289). If one is Sidney's, why not more? There is one incomplete sonnet which seems to me peculiarly interesting when connected with this possibility. It appears to be an early attempt of his, the initial line of which developed into that glorious "Valedico" sonnet which is one of the treasures of English literature. Any one who has ever written poetry will remember how a good line in a weak poem will cling in the memory and be the germ from which a quite different and far better one develops. This seems to be the case here if we accept the poor wail as Sidney's.

It has a line of thought common in the Stella sonnets. Compare this from lxxii.

"Desire, though thou my old companion art  
And oft so clings to my pure love that I  
One from the other scarcely can descrie  
While each doth blow the fier of my heart;

But thou, Desire, because thou wouldst have  
all

Now banisht art, and yet, alas, how shall?"  
with the latter part of the waif which follows.

"Leave me, O life, the prison of my minde  
Since nought but death can take away my  
love,

For she which likes me wel is most unkinde  
And that which I love best my death doth  
prove.

Love in her eyes my hopes againe revives  
Hopes in my thoughts doe kindle my desires  
Desire inflamed through love and beauty  
strives

Til she (displeased with love) my death con-  
spires.

That love for me and I for love do call  
Yet she denies because she grants not all."

(Gros. ed. of Breton, vol. i, A. of A.D. section, p. 6).

The Sidney "Valedico" sonnet which may have developed from the preceding is

"Leave me, O Love, which reachest but to  
dust,  
And thou my mind aspire to higher things;  
Grow rich in that which never taketh rust;  
Whatever fades but fading pleasure brings.  
Draw in thy beams, and humble all thy might,  
To that sweet yoke where tasting freedoms  
be:  
Which breakes the clowdes and opens forth  
the light,  
That doth both shine and give us sight to see.  
O take fast hold, let that light be thy guide.  
In this small course which birth drawes not to  
death  
And think how evill becommeth him to slide  
Who seeketh heaven, and comes of heavenly  
breath.

"And cast from me *part of my burdenous  
cares*"

But in *the sands* my *tales* foretold I find."

(ll. 14 and 15 on page 176<sup>b</sup> of '90 quarto).

"*Both still do worke*, in neither find I rest."  
(90 quarto, pages 214, ll. 3).

In the long pastoral on pages 94<sup>b</sup>-96<sup>b</sup> of the '90 quarto, in line 42 occurs "serene," which the manuscript text makes "Syran," an emendation which would do away with the necessity of the explanatory note which Dr. Grosart has put to the passage in his edition, (Vol. ii. p. 199.). On the whole I do not think the manuscript variations of much value, yet of enough that they ought not to be overlooked by the scholar who shall give us the much-needed edition of the *Arcadia* which shall

Grosart text.

Fourth Song, (Stanza 4).

"*This* small light the moone bestowes  
Serves thy beames but to disclose;  
So to raise my hap more hie,  
*Feare not else* none can us spie."

Then farewell, world, thy uttermost I see,  
Eternall Love, maintain thy life in me."

Gros. ed. Sidney, Vol. i., p. 147.

Of course this waif sonnet may be simply an imitation of Sidney, and may be Breton's work. That he is open to the charge of plagiarism appears from Dr. Grosart's long, elaborate and not convincingly exonerating defence of him as regards the passages of his poems which are strikingly similar to some of Watson's works. Perhaps he caught the Sidneian strain at a few rare intervals. Perhaps he was the mocking-bird in the Elizabethan nest. Who knows?

There remains to be treated yet, under the subject of Sidney's poems in this Rawlinson manuscript, the variant readings which the text gives, and the Sidney poems signed by other names. A few examples of the variations will best show their value. I give from the text of the '90 quarto of the *Arcadia* to show that it differs from the manuscript text, which is supposedly contemporaneous.

"And cast from me *the burthens* of my care  
But in *these* sands my *pains* foretold I find."

(Rawl. Poet. 85, fol. 23<sup>b</sup>).

"*Both working still*, in neither find I rest."

(Rawl. Poet. 85, fol. 23).

have a good text and adequate notes.

The manuscript offers curiously few changes in the poems which are printed in the *Certaine Sonets*, and the two for which it is the source are, naturally, the ones without changes—except in the case of the lost stanzas which I have given above.

This leaves the three Stella songs to be considered. They have many changes even in some rather important passages.

MS. text.

"*These* small lights the moone bestowes  
Serves thy beames but to disclose;  
And to raise my hap more hie  
*For naught els*, none can us spy.

## Fourth Song, (Stanza 6).

"Niggard time threatens if *we* misse,  
This large offer of *our* blisse  
*Long stay ere he* grant the same."

## Sixth Song (stanza 5).

"Musick more loftly swels  
In *speeches nobly* placed"

## Eight Song (Stanza 14).

"Never season *was* more fit;  
Never *roome* more apt for it;  
*Smiling ayre* allowes my reason;  
These birds sing *Now use the* season."

## Tenth Song (stanza 8).

"O my thought, my thoughts surcease  
*Thy* delights my *woes* increase  
*My life melts* with too much thinking  
*Thinke no more but die in* me  
*Till thou shalt revived be*  
*At her lips* my nectar drinking."

But most of the changes in these songs are not better readings, and I should not wish to see them substituted for the '91 quarto text.

Of the two Sidney poems which in this manuscript are signed by other names, one "Finding those beams which I must ever love" has "Mr. Norrell" appended; the other, the Stella song "O dear love when shall it be," is attributed to Breton. The former is one of the best of Sidney's sonnets outside the Stella cycle; Dr. Grosart prints it with his *Sidera*, and Mr. Pollard in his supplement, thus showing that they consider it to be one which has close connection of thought and style with those of the cycle. It was first printed among the *Certaine Sonets*, '98 *Arcadia*, p. 481, and is found in fol. 12 in the manuscript. The song is one of the sweetest and most precious of Elizabethan songs. We cannot let Breton claim that. It is in the '91 quartos and occurs on foll. 107b-108 of the manuscript.

This ends the Sidneian literature of this interesting manuscript, except several poems on his death, one of which, a long pastoral with Spenserian touches, I have not found elsewhere, though it is probably somewhere in the mass of printed matter which the death of Sidney called forth. The only topic of much value which the manuscript has sug-

"Niggard time threatens if *you* misse  
This large offer of *your* blisse.  
*No longer stay but* graunt the same."

"In *phrases finely* placed."

"Never season *yet* more fit;  
Never *tyme* more apt for it,  
*These sweet trees* allow my reason;  
These birds sing '*Now is thy* season.'"

*My* thought, my thought surcease  
*These* delights my *paynes* increase,  
*And I dy with* too much thinking  
*Thoughte therefore come sleepe with* me  
*Until thou maist awaked be*  
*At her mouth* my nectar drinking."

gested is that of the Sidney *vs.* Breton, which, considering the varied sources of the evidence, seems at present to incline toward Sidney's side.

MARY BOWEN.

Oxford, England.

## EDITIONS OF 'MARIA STUART.'

*Maria Stuart* edited by EDWARD S. JOYNES,  
M. A. New York: Holt & Co. 1894, pp.  
xli, 266.

*Maria Stuart* edited by LEWIS A. RHOADES,  
Ph. D. Boston: Heath & Co., 1894, pp.  
xxiv, 232.

*Maria Stuart* edited by KARL BREUL, M.A.,  
Ph. D. Cambridge: University Press. 1893.  
Pitt Press Series, pp. xxxii, 272.

For many reasons, Schiller's *Maria Stuart* may be regarded as the most useful of his dramas for introducing our students to a reading of the classics. Its limited scope and rapid development, its nearness in subject to American students, its essential nobility and loftiness of sentiment, its freedom from strained romanticism, give it advantages over any other of his works for this purpose. It is perhaps an indication of subserviency to Eng-



lish influences in literature that the play has been somewhat neglected in this country, for the delineation of Elizabeth has always been unacceptable to the English national feeling.

We have recently been given three excellent texts, each of which is a gratifying indication of the present plane of modern language studies. Prof. Joynes's text, entirely recast after fifteen years, is of especial pedagogic interest, and shows great advance over his former edition. It is a useful and attractive book, whose object is to bring fairly mature students most effectively into the appreciative reading of the work. The most suggestive remark, in the light of present debatable issues, is,

"The student who begins a literary work like *Maria Stuart* should feel that he has now risen above the plane of mere language study, and should be helped, so far as may be, to read and enjoy Schiller or Goethe in the same spirit, if not yet to the same degree, as like masterpieces in his mother-tongue."

It will be admitted that this theory has been carried out with the utmost consistency, indeed with an almost radical suppression of inherited "philological" apparatus. A reverent piety toward the aesthetic beauties of Schiller's work is characteristic of the manner of treatment, and a sympathetic penetration into its spirit is manifested. The life of Schiller, Introduction, and Notes are clear and helpful to the purposes in view. Exception must be taken to the statement (p. xl) that in *Maria Stuart* the author "for the first time employs lyric stanzas." Are not the soldier-songs in *Wallenstein's Lager* and Thekla's song in *Die Piccolomini* to be so classed? It is to be regretted that, if Bohn's translation of the correspondence "is not very good," it should be cited at all. Waiving further detailed criticism, the book is to be unhesitatingly recommended as an available help to younger students of German literature.

Dr. Rhoades's edition is on a higher plane of criticism, and somewhat more learned in treatment. The standpoint of the editor involves the leading back of the drama to the philosophic dramatical principles upon which it was constructed. This plan does not interfere with simplicity in annotation, some

of the grammatical notes being very elementary. The edition is entirely creditable, and based upon wide critical and historical information. As regards its form, it seems unfortunate that the editor's reluctance to break a line between Scenes 12 and 13 of the fifth act, have led him to an enumeration of the lines of the text which varies from the others mentioned. For such an interrupted line we have sufficient warrant in *Piccolomini* iii, Scenes 2 and 3, and *Wallenstein's Tod*, iii, Scenes 1 and 2. In the note to l. 886 *Eurem* should stand for *Einem*; in l. 1009 *war* appears for *wahr*.

Breul's text continues to be the most complete English edition, with quite a full bibliographical apparatus. The editor rather apologizes for reducing the etymological notes, though the lack of such, as well as of those involving comparative grammar, synonyms, and variously associated items of linguistic information, is not apparent. The minute dissection of the subject-matter of the drama belongs to the histologic method which is characteristic of English texts, but it seems strange that the editor, in one of his excursions into the field of general information, should gratuitously condemn Schiller's metrical freedom by an appeal to sources which were possibly his warrant for the liberty. Commenting on l. 1099, where the same word, repeated, is treated as stressed and unstressed, Breul remarks,

"This would be quite impossible in Latin or Greek versification, where only quantity is considered and where the same syllable cannot as a rule be used either long or short."

Vergil's repetition *Hyla Hyla* (Ecl. 6, 44), and Martial's *Apes Apes* (9, 11, 15) cast a peculiar light upon this note.

J. T. HATFIELD.

Northwestern University.

#### ENGLISH VERSE.

*Repetition and Parallelism in English Verse:*

a study in the technique of poetry. By C. ALPHONSO SMITH. 8vo, pp. 76. New York and New Orleans: University Publishing Company, 1894.

TREATISES on English verse, both in a general way and with regard to special problems, are not by any means lacking, yet every student will extend a hearty welcome to the above named work by Dr. C. Alphonso Smith, professor of English in the Louisiana State University, and formerly assistant in English in the Johns Hopkins University. Not recently has there appeared so little a book that contains so much in the way of suggestive and penetrating criticism. If real suggestiveness be the criterion in determining what is best in literary criticism, surely this treatise deserves a high rank in its special field.

Dr. Smith divides his book into five chapters, as follows: I. Introduction; Nature and Agencies of Repetition and Parallelism; Illustrations. II. Greek Influence: Repetition in the English Elegy. III. Finnish Influence: Repetition in "Hiawatha" and other Finnish Imitations. IV. Repetition in the Poems of Edgar Allan Poe. V. Repetition in the Poems of Algernon Charles Swinburne.

In the first chapter the subject is fully defined:

"In verse, repetition is chiefly employed not for emphasis (compare the use of the refrain), but for melody or rhythm, for continuousness or sonorousness of effect, for unity of impression, for banding lines or stanzas, and for the more indefinable though not less important purposes of suggestiveness."

A number of examples are cited in illustration of the value of repetition and parallelism, and it is to be noted that these examples show the wide range of the author's reading. A suggestive remark is contained in this (p. 18):

"The study of repetition in the works of any poet brings us much nearer to a right appreciation of his characteristic style than the study of his rimes, his line-lengths, or his poetic feet can ever do. For in repetition we trace the precise movement of the poet's thought, we gauge his pace; and this cannot be shown with equal clearness in any other way."

The second and third chapters are very short, and their paragraphs are the most lucid in the book. But it is in the last two chapters that most of the value of the book lies. Dr. Smith has studied his Poe and his Swinburne most carefully, and the result is an

acute criticism not simply of their metrical methods, but of their poetical merits and demerits as well. Herein is seen the value of a special study of the metrical effects of these two much misunderstood poets. For instance, Mr. Stedman, to whom we are great debtors for some of the best of our latter day criticism, had not studied Swinburne thoroughly when he said that Swinburne was "a born tamer of words," for Dr. Smith shows conclusively that "Swinburne is a tamer not of words but of sounds."

Dr. Smith's chapter on Poe is the best portion of his book, and it should be widely read by Poe's countrymen. Commenting on Mr. Gosse's query as to the lack of appreciation of Poe in America our author says (pp. 45, 46):

"It is to be regretted that foreign critics, while paying deserved tribute to Poe, should see fit, by way of intended antithesis, to indulge in belittling comments upon American literature as a whole. Does not the real antithesis lie in the contrast between foreign appreciation of Poe and foreign ignorance of American literature in general? However this may be, it is certain that Poe's fame has suffered from the indiscriminate eulogy of friends almost as much as from the coarse slander of enemies."

The much abused comparison of Poe and Longfellow is thus given its quietus (p. 51):

"To compare Poe with Longfellow, as is so often done, is to compare two men who had almost nothing in common, whose views of the poetic art were almost antipodal, and whose works, valuable and enduring as both are, will not bear comparison, being wholly unamenable to the same law or laws."

The chapter closes with a summing up that inevitably follows from Dr. Smith's arguments (p. 56):

"The conflicting opinions held especially in this country in regard to Poe's genius and to the originality and permanence of his work are due, I am convinced, almost entirely to the failure to judge his work by the canons of criticism that alone are applicable. If put upon the same plane with Longfellow and Tennyson, Poe is insignificant beside them. His range is narrower than theirs, his voice thinner. But in the realm of the older ballad, in complete mastery of the sensuous effects that lurk in color, form, and sound, heightened by brooding and indefinable gloom, Poe takes easy and secure precedence. Room for him



here must be made beside Bürger, Goethe, and Coleridge."

Dr. Smith's book was not printed to exploit any pet theory or to make prominent any critical idiosyncrasy of its author. It is clear, concise, and full of substance expressed in an easy and convincing style. Defects may be found occasionally, for no book is without them; but the work is of such positive merit as to call for high commendation. Following the German method, one might be disposed to tear it to pieces; but as its criticism is itself constructive, it deserves equally as good treatment at the hands of a reviewer. It is to be hoped that Dr. Smith will regard this work only as the forerunner of a larger and more complete treatise on English verse in general.

In conclusion, I may be pardoned if I insert as a slight supplement to his examples a little poem by Mr. William Watson, which depends for its beauty and melody on its repetitions, and which, with strange fatuity, the author has omitted from the latest edition of his poems.

#### A SONG OF THREE SINGERS.

"Wave and wind and willow-tree  
Speak a speech that no man knoweth;  
Tree that sigheth, wind that bloweth,  
Wave that floweth to the sea:  
Wave and wind and willow-tree.

"Peerless perfect poets ye,  
Singing songs all songs excelling.  
Fine as crystal music dwelling  
In a welling fountain free:  
Peerless perfect poets three!

"Wave and wind and willow-tree  
Know not aught of poets' rhyming,  
Yet they make a silver-chiming  
Sunward-climbing minstrelsy,  
Soother than all songs could be.

"Blows the wind it knows not why,  
Flows the wave it knows not whither,  
And the willow swayeth hither,  
Swayeth thither witlessly  
Nothing knowing save to sigh."

CHARLES HUNTER ROSS.

*Agricul. and Mech. College of Alabama.*

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### SOME MANUSCRIPT READINGS IN THE POEMA DE FERNAN GONZALEZ.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Señor Cuervo, in the first instalment of his article "Los casos enclíticos y proclíticos del pronombre de tercera persona en castellano" in *Romania* Vol. xxiv, p. 109, mentions among others the following cases of the use of *los* in the dative for *les*: "'non los pudo ninguno aquesto rretraer' del Fernan Gonzalez con otro verso en que varian las ediciones (copla 116)." The writer omits the reference to his quotation; it is Janer's copla 45, Gallardo<sup>2</sup> I, col. 775, l. 38. Now, though both editions read *los*, in the Escorial manuscript upon which both of the printed texts are based, the reading is *les*. To be sure, the vowel in the MSS. is blurred, which fact may account for the misreading on the part of both editors, but when the word is examined by aid of the glass, there is no doubt that the vowel is *e* not *o*.

The second occurrence cited by Señor Cuervo, shows different reading in the two editions; Janer copla 116 has *les*, the corresponding passage in Gallardo i, col. 769, l. 58, has *los*. In the manuscript the interior of the vowel is blotted, so that it is difficult to determine whether the vowel is *e* or *o*. A comparative study of the other occurrences of *les* and *los* in the same work, leads me to write *les*. I call attention, in passing, to a reading of Janer in a portion of the poem not included in the 1000 lines examined by Cuervo. Janer copla 269b, has "Porque *les* dexó ver atamanna maravylla," whereas Gallardo reads *los* in this verse. The manuscript agrees with Janer's text in regard to the form of the pronoun.

A final remark in regard to the textual value of the two editions of the poem in question. Janer, in speaking of his text, remarks: "Conservamos con la mayor escrupulosidad el

<sup>1</sup> *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, Vol. lvii, Madrid, 1864.

<sup>2</sup> *Ensayo de una Biblioteca Española de libros raros y curiosos*, Vol. i, Madrid, 1863.



carácter y la ortografía del codice que contiene esta preciosa composicion,"<sup>3</sup> but in spite of this statement, his text contains over five hundred false readings, among which are numerous omissions of letters, words and in one case, of an entire verse.<sup>4</sup>

Gallardo's edition is by no means a careful copy of the original, for it too is rich in mis-readings, including omissions of letters, words and, in seventeen cases, of entire verses.<sup>5</sup>

The above facts make it evident that statistics and conclusions based on such texts cannot be considered trustworthy and it is this condition of affairs that has led me to undertake the preparation of a paleographic text of the poem.

C. C. MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

### MIDDLE ENGLISH CITATION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the February number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, col. 93, Professor Baldwin asks for information concerning the poem from which Halliwell took the two lines there cited. They are from *The Romance of Sir Eglamour of Artois* (*Thornton Romances*, ed. Halliwell, 1844, p. 134).—

The yeant to the knyȝt ys gon,  
A clobb of yron in honde hathe tan,  
That was mekylle and fulle unwelde;  
Grete strokys the yeant gafe,  
And to the erthe fley hys stafe  
Two fote on every syde.

A. S. NAPIER.

University of Oxford.

### BRIEF MENTION.

The *Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte*, edited by Bernhard Seuffert, the publication of which was discontinued after

<sup>3</sup> *Bib. de Auct. Esp.*, Vol. lvii, p. 389 note.

<sup>4</sup> Coplo 504c.

<sup>5</sup> Corresponding to Jauer, coplas 15d, 34c, 60c, 84d, 117b, 144b, 153c, 168c, 291d, 331c, 334d, 501c, 556 entire copla and 657d.

the completion of the sixth volume (see MOD. LANG. NOTES, ix, 31), was succeeded by *Euphorion*, *Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, edited by Professor A. Sauer of Prague (Bamberg: C. C. Buchner). The new journal has just entered upon its second volume. The first volume contains contributions by A. E. Schönbach, O. Harnack, J. Minor, R. M. Meyer, K. Werner, B. Seuffert, J. Bolte, A. Leitzmann, E. Schmidt, H. Baumgart, M. Herrmann, A. Sauer, W. Frhr. von Biedermann, L. Geiger, H. Blümner, W. Creizenach and others well known as investigators in literary history. As the older publications devoted to the history of the German language and literature have all gradually devoted themselves almost entirely either to linguistics or to mediæval literature, the *Euphorion* occupies at present a unique place in periodical literature as the only journal devoted exclusively to the history of German literature since the Reformation. The names of the principal contributors vouch for the scientific value of the journal, and it is to be hoped that the public will not allow this new enterprise to share the fate of its predecessor.

With the laudable purpose of making the poetry of Lanier more widely known, and especially of providing a little work suitable for literature-classes, Prof. Callaway has published a helpful anthology: *Select Poems of Sidney Lanier*: edited by Morgan Callaway Jr., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895. The selections are representative; the introduction gives us a satisfactory acquaintance with the poet, his work, and his views of art; and the excellent notes not only illustrate the text, but indicate suggestively the treatment of similar themes by other poets. An intelligent class might learn from these notes a delightful as well as profitable method of studying poetic themes.

## JOURNAL NOTICES.

ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITTERATUREN. XCIII. BAND, I. U. 2. HEFT.—**von Kyssel, V.**, Syrische Quellenabendländischer Erzählungsstoffe.—**von Leltzmann, Albert**, Ungedruckte Briefe Georg Forsters. IV, 3.—**von Henkel, Hermann**, Goethes satirisch-humoristische Dichtungen dramatischer Form.—**von Kolbing, E.**, Kollationen zu Ausgaben isländischer romantischer Sagas.—**von Sehnitz, Oskar**, Über den Liederstreit zwischen Sordel und Peire Bremon.—**Tobler, Adolf**, Zu 'Un samedi par nuit'.—**Schmillnsky, G.**, Proben einer Übersetzung der Chanson de Roland.—Sitzungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für das Studium der neueren Sprachen. Neuphilologischer Verein in Wien.—**Tobler, Adolf**, John Ries, Was ist Syntax? Ein kritischer Versuch.—**Glode, O.**, O. Rohde, Die Erzählung vom Einsiedler und dem Engel in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Exempel-Litteratur.—**Tobler, Adolf**, Gaston Paris. La Légende de Saladin.—**Frankel, Ludwig**, Systematisches Verzeichnis der Programmabhandlungen, Dissertationen und Habilitationsschriften aus dem Gebiete der romanischen und englischen Philologie, sowie der allgemeinen Sprach- und Litteraturwissenschaft und der Pädagogik und Methodik. Von Hermann Varnhagen. Zweite vollständig umgearbeitete Auflage. Besorgt von Johannes Martin.—**Schmidt, Max C. P.**, Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft. Red. von Carl Glossy.—**Frankel, Ludwig**, Das niederdeutsche Schauspiel. Zum Kulturleben Hamburgs. Von Karl Theodor Gaedertz. Neue, um zwei Vorworte vermehrte Auflage.—**Z., J.**, Allgemeine Sammlung niederdeutscher Rätsel. Nebst einigen anderen, mundartlichen Rätselaufgaben und Auflösungen. Herausgegeben von Rudolf Echart.—**Z., J.**, History of the English Language. By T. R. Lounsbury. Revised and enlarged Edition.—**Mangold, W.**, Dr. Immanuel Schmidt, Lehrbuch der englischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Schulgrammatik der englischen Sprache mit Übungsbeispielen. 4. Umgearbeitete Auflage.—**Opitz, G.**, 1. English Grammar, I und Part. Neue englische Schulgrammatik auf Grund seines Lesebuches 'England and the English' bearbeitet von Dr. Heinrich Löwe.—2. England and the English. Neues englisches Lesebuch für deutsche Schulen. Mittelstufe. Mit Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Dr. Heinrich Löwe.—**Opitz, G.**, Dr. Ew. Görlich, Wörterbuch zu dem englischen Lesebuch.—**Z., J.**, Shaksperes 'Sturm.' Ein Kulturbild von Paul Roden.—**Z., J.**, Die göttliche Rowe. Von Theodor Vetter.—**Mueller, Ad.**, Diekmann, Französische und englische Schulbibliothek.—**Krueger, G.**, The prisoner of Chillon. Mazedra by Lord Byron. Mit Anmerkungen zum Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. K. Bandow.—**Opitz, G.**, Argyle's and Monmouth's Attempts on Scotland and England in 1685. By Th. B. Macaulay. In gekürzter Fassung herausgegeben von Professor O. Schmager.—**Z., J.**, Miss Ormerod's Protégé. By F. C. Phillips.—**Z., J.**, Penshurst Castle in the time of Sir Philip Sidney. By Emma Marshall.—**Z., J.**, The Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes. By A. Conan Doyle.—**Z., J.**, A Protégée of Jack Hamlin's, etc. By Bret

Harte.—**Z., J.**, A Ward in Chancery. By Mrs. Alexander.—**Z., J.**, Saint Ann's. By W. E. Norris.—**Z., J.**, The Red House Mystery. A Novel. By Mrs. Hungerford.—**Frankel, Ludwig**, Friedrich Diez. Sein Leben und Wirken. Festschrift gehalten zur Feier des hundertsten Geburtstages am 3. März 1894 von Hermann Breyman.—**Krueger, G.**, Deutsch-französisches Übungsbuch von Arnold Ohlert.—**Krueger, G.**, Französisches Lesebuch für die ersten Unterrichtsjahre. Vornehmlich für Realschulen und verwandte Lehranstalten. Herausgeg. von F. Scheibner und G. Schauerhammer.—**Mahrenholtz, R.**, Dr. Georg Stern. Französ. Lesebuch für die Mittelstufe.—**Krueger, G.**, Französische und englische Schulbibliothek, herausgegeben von Otto E. A. Dickmann. C. IX.—**Krueger, G.**, Textausgaben französischer und englischer Schriftsteller für den Schulgebrauch.—**Krueger, G.**, Bibliothèque française.—**Krueger, G.**, Au Coin du Feu par Émile Souvestre. Erklärt von Dr. A. Güth.—Dritte Auflage besorgt von Prof. Dr. G. Lüicking.—**Mangold, W.**, L. Bahlens und J. Hengesbach, Schulbibliothek französischer und englischer Prosaschriften aus der neueren Zeit.—**Cloetta, Wilhelm**, Joseph L. dier, Les Fabliaux. Études de littérature populaire et d'histoire littéraire du moyen âge.—**Tobler, Adolf**, B. Zumbini, sulle poesie di Vincenzo Monti, Studi. Terza edizione interamente riveduta con la giunta di un discorso dell'autore sulla nostra presente critica letteraria.—**Mueller, Ad.**, G. Spill, Über den neu-fremdsprachlichen Unterricht.—**Franz, Feyer**, Der neue Sprachunterricht.—**Findlay, J. J.**, Preparations for Instruction in English on a Direct Method.—**Mangold, W.**, Dr. K. Mähfeld, Die Lehre von der Vorstellungsverwandtschaft und ihre Anwendung auf den Sprachunterricht.—Verzeichnis der vom 24. Mai bis zum 20. Juli 1894 bei der Redaktion eingelaufenen Druckschriften.

DIE NEUEREN SPRACHEN. ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEN NEUSPRACHLICHEN UNTERRICHT, MIT DEM BEIPLATT PHONETISCHE STUDIEN. II BAND. 6 HEFT.—**von Glode, O.**, In Weimar i. M., (II). Die Französische Interpunktionslehre.—**von Uthemann-v. Schenck, Marie**, In Kassel. Übersetzungen aus dem englischen.—**von Regel, Ernst**, In Halle a. S. Lehr- und Lesebuch der englischen Sprache nach der analytisch-direkten Methode für höhere Schulen von Dr. Julius Bierbaum.—**von Beyer, A.**, In Brema. Englisches elementarbuch für gymnasien von Dr. Adolph Lüttge.—E. H. Barnstorff, Lehr- und Lesebuch der englischen Sprache.—Joh. Sehmarje und E. H. Barnstorff, Englisches Lesebuch.—**von Kron, R.**, In M.-Gladbach. Schmagersehe textausgaben. (12) Celebrated Men of England and Scotland, hsg. von Dr. O. Schulze.—(13) Auswahl aus Byron: Child Harold, Prisoner of Chillon, Mazeppa, hsg. von Dr. J. Hengesbach.—**von Hoffmann, H.**, In Ratibor. Albert Heintze, Gut deutsch.—**von D. F.**, B. A. Jourdan, An English Girl in France, hsg. von Dr. C. Th. Lion 2. aufl.—**von Kuehn, K.**, In Wiesbaden. Zu prof. Schippers 'nach-träglichen bemerkungen'.—**von Rambeau, A.**, In Mountain Lake Park, Md. Das lektorenwesen.—**von Suetterlin, Ludwig**, In Heidelberg. Erklärung.—**von Bruns-wiek, Dr.**, In Wiesbaden. Erwidern.—**von Roemer, Ludwig**, In Frankfurt a. M. Antwort.—**von Banner, Dr.**, In Frankfurt a. M. Erklärung.—**von V. W.**, Noch einmal alt- und neuenglisch auf den deutschen universitäten.—**von D. F.**, In Frankfurt a. M. Ferienkursus (3.—15. januar 1895).



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May 1895.

"VERGEBEN" IN GOETHE'S TASSO,

II, 3; l. 1404.

AMONG the passages in Goethe's Tasso hitherto not explained to the full satisfaction of commentators, the line:

"Vergib dir nur, dem Ort vergiebst du nichts" (1404),

has probably called forth the largest number of differing opinions. A natural connection with the context and the ability to satisfy its own author are two things in favor of the explanation attempted in the following lines, neither of which is claimed by Kern, Düntzer, Strehlke and Thomas for their respective renderings.

In line 1394:

"Welch hoher Geist in einer engen Brust!"—

Antonio scoffs at the excessive passion and boldness of Tasso; reminds him that in fighting with words he makes himself no better than the rabble, and thus provokes Tasso's challenge anew. Not inclined to accept it, Antonio refuses on grounds valid in themselves, but not proof against Tasso's rage:

"... doch weiss ich, wo ich bin" (1398),

and:

"Wie du nicht fordern solltest, folg' ich nicht" (1400).

In thus reminding Tasso that as an inferior in rank and age he ought not to challenge, nor to expect to have his challenge heeded, he hints at the real obstacle; but as Tasso sees in these refusals simply pretenses invented by cowardice, Antonio mentions plainly the qualities in Tasso owing to which his challenge is refused: his cowardice, implying, of course, other attendant characteristics indicated above:

"Der Feige droht nur, wo er sicher ist" (1402),

using the adverb *wo* in the secondary sense (=falls);—cf. II. 1376-7:

"Du traust auf Schonung, die dich nur zu sehr  
Im frechen Laufe deines Glücks verzog."

Tasso, still not perceiving Antonio's real meaning, and misapprehending the ambiguous word *wo*, once more urges that they repair to a place where the duel may be fought. Then

Antonio removes the last doubt by insisting, that the fault lies not in the place, but in Tasso himself:

"Vergieb dir nur, dem Ort vergiebst du nichts."

*Vergeben* has here, through its first meaning, 'to pardon,' the not very unnatural additional one: 'to accuse,' to 'impute to,' and with this substitution the line might be paraphrased: "Schreib's nur dir selber zu, was du erfährst, denn wahrlich,—an dem Ort liegt nicht die Schuld, also hast du auch dem Ort nichts zu vergeben." Tasso now fully understands Antonio's position and the cause of his refusal, and, exasperated at the thought that not even the sanctity of the place could prevent indignities such as he has suffered from Antonio, he cries out: [Habe ich also dem Ort nichts zu vergeben, so]

"Verzeihe mir der Ort, dass ich es litt,"

and draws his sword.

The wrong implied in the word *vergeben* gives to it the peculiar significance in this place; if I forgive or pardon any one, he must first have committed some wrong against me.—

In exactly the same way *vergeben* is used in Schiller's *Don Carlos* iv, 14, where the queen says to Alva and Domingo:

"Denn wirklich

Muss ich gestehn, ich war schon in Gefahr,  
Den schlimmen Dienst, der mir bei meinem Herrn  
Geleistet worden,—Ihnen zu vergeben."

With "Den schlimmen Dienst" she refers to the forcible opening of her casket and the disclosure of her correspondence with Don Carlos to her husband, the king.

In two passages from Lessing it is possible to interpret the word *vergeben* in the same way: the first is in his *Briefe, die neueste Litteratur betreffend*, Dritter Theil, 49 Brief, about the middle of the letter:

"Da ich zugegeben, dass die geoffenbarte Religion, unsere Bewegungsgründe, recht-schaffen zu handeln, vermehre, so sehen Sie wohl, dass ich der Religion nichts *vergeben* will. Nur auch der Vernunft nichts."

I should interpret: so sehen Sie wohl, dass ich der Religion gegenüber keineswegs eine feindliche Stellung einzunehmen beabsichtige, an ihr keine Mängel suche. Again, *Briefe an*



*verschiedene Gottesgelehrte*, in the second letter to Dr. Walch:

"Ich setze diesem schneidenden Satze andere vielleicht (dieses "Vielleicht" soll mir aber durchaus nichts *vergeben*) eben so schneidende Sätze entgegen."

T. DIEKHOFF.

University of Michigan.

#### NOTE ON THE PHOENIX, VERSE 151.

VERSE 59 of the Latin *Phoenix*

"Quae postquam uitae iam mille peregerit annos"

becomes in the Old-English translation

*oð þæt he þusende þisses lifes  
wudubearwes weard wintra gebideð.*

All the editions that I have seen retain the reading *þusende* in this passage, though Grein cites it as *þusendo* in his Glossary. Thorpe translates it "a thousand," perhaps because he took it for a singular, but more probably from mere ignorance or inadvertence, if we can judge from the general character of his version of the Exeter poetry; Bright marks it in his glossary as plural.

A plural form *þusende* can be explained only by assuming that English has kept the feminine form along with the neuter, as in some of the other tongues of the Group. This involves no serious difficulty, but it would not be easy to find a good reason for a change from singular to plural by the translator, especially in view of the fact that the length of life of the Phoenix is expressed by *þusend wintra* in verse 364 also. I am inclined to explain the form, therefore, as a singular. As is shown by the other Teutonic languages, the word for "thousand" was originally double in form, the stem ending either in *-jo*, (neuter) or in *-jā*, (feminine). The former would give us a nom.-acc. sg. *þusende*, like *ærende*; the usual form *þusend* is the result of the transfer to the simple *o*-stems. An older form is found in many words once or twice, though the later form is the prevailing one, and this may be the present case. An excellent analogy is furnished in verse 590 of the same poem, where we have a nom. sg. *hælende* instead of the usual form *hælend*. (*Hælende* is also found in the *Orosius*, p. 250, ed. Sweet.)

The only other instances of a form *þusende*

that I have found, are cited in Grein's Glossary from the *Psalms*. In civ, 8, we have *on þusende* for the Latin "in mille." If we had a right to assume that the translation is exact, this form would rightly be considered an acc. sg., but it may be dative. The other case is cxviii, 72, where *þusende goldes and seolfres* translates "millia auri et argenti." This may be cited in confirmation of the existence of a feminine form in English, if that theory be adopted to explain the form in the *Phoenix*. It would be quite as easy, however, to assume that the translator changed the word to the singular in this passage, as that it was changed to the plural in the other.

If this explanation is not accepted, I should be inclined to amend the reading to *þusend*. This reading is favored by its occurrence in verse 364, and by the Latin original. The reading in the text may be the result of a blunder on the part of the copyist, who was misled by the following words *þisses lifes*, into supposing that the meaning was "the end of this life," and changed *þusend* accordingly to *þus ende*. For the metre of the hemistich, when thus amended, compare verse 166.

F. A. BLACKBURN.

University of Chicago.

#### ARRANGEMENT OF THE CANTERBURY TALES.

FOR more than a century this subject has claimed attention, but only a few years ago one of our leaders in criticism said:—

"No criticism has succeeded in making out anything like a sound and satisfactory arrangement. And even the latest ingenious and applauded attempt of this kind was foredoomed to failure (except by violent and arbitrary proceedings) from the impossibility of reconciling contradictions which the poet did not remove."

The matter is by no means so desperate; all this labor has not been in vain, and criticism has been remarkably successful in removing apparent contradictions and revealing a consistent plan underlying the unfinished work. However, a thorough examination of the subject has convinced me that the accepted ar-

1 Ten Brink, *English Literature*, ii, pt. 1 (trans. Robinson), New York, 1893, p. 150.

rangement should be modified in some important particulars, and I hope now to offer a scheme that will represent still more nearly the plan Chaucer must have had in mind. It may be thought not out of place to give, first, a complete but concise account of what has been said concerning the order of the tales. This will put the whole matter in accessible form and make an immediate consideration of the question possible.

For the sake of clearness the subject will be taken up in the following order: I, Historical outline of attempts to put the tales in proper order; II, Stages of the journey; III, Order of the tales.

The following theorems, the acceptance of which is necessary for any attempted solution of the question, may be given without comment.

1. Chaucer left the *Canterbury Tales* unfinished, and we now have what he wrote in whole or in part.<sup>2</sup>

2. The journey as planned by Chaucer is consistent with reality, even if it did not actually take place, and we are to expect no more contradictions than the unfinished state of the work would justify.

#### I. HISTORICAL OUTLINE.

Our attention should be directed first to the grouping of the tales in the different MSS., which vary widely, but may be roughly divided into four classes according to the order in which the tales occur.<sup>3</sup>

- A. 1. Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook.<sup>4</sup>
2. Man of Law.
3. Wife of Bath, Friar, Sompnour.
4. Clerk, Merchant.
5. Squire, Franklin.
6. Doctor, Pardoner.
7. Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibeus, Monk, Nun's Priest.
8. Second Nun, Canon's Yeoman.
9. Manciple, (slightly linked to) Parson.

<sup>2</sup> See Tyrwhitt, *Canterbury Tales*, 1822, i, p. 162, n. 33; Furnivall, *Temporary Preface*, p. 10 f; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 373; Ten Brink, *l.c.*, p. 149 f.

<sup>3</sup> This summary is taken from the *Oxford Chaucer*, iv, p. xxiii, where Skeat gives in admirable form some of the matter presented in Furnivall's 'Trial Tables' in the *Six-Text Edition*.

<sup>4</sup> *Gamelyn* is wanting in all MSS. of the A-type, and in some of the D-type.

B. Places 8 before 6. Order: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 6, 7, 9.

C. Not only places 8 before 6, but divides 5 into 5a (Squire) and 5b (Franklin), and places 5a before 3. Order: 1, 2, 5a, 3, 4, 5b, 8, 6, 7, 9.

D. Makes all changes made by C-type and also divides 4 into 4a (Clerk) and 4b (Merchant), and places 4b after 5a. Order: 1, 2, 5a, 4b, 3, 4a, 5b, 8, 6, 7, 9.

The editors of the early printed editions,—Thynne, Stow,<sup>5</sup> Speght,<sup>6</sup> Urry, Morell, seem to have been unconscious of any lack of unity in the manuscript scheme; at least they make no mention of it in their notes. The first editor to attempt any study of the order of the tales was Tyrwhitt,<sup>7</sup> 1775. From the various prologues and scraps of conversation, he makes out a scheme in which he 'flatters himself he has not been unsuccessful in restoring the true order,' at least in part. The order he adopts is that of the Ellesmere MS. (A-type). Tyrwhitt had a very clear grasp of the whole subject and many of his keen observations stand the test of present scholarship.

After Tyrwhitt, nothing was said for many years. Wright, 1847, broke the long silence, but for the most part he only repeats what Tyrwhitt has said.<sup>8</sup>

Dean Stanley,<sup>9</sup> 1855, gives an entertaining but entirely untrustworthy account of the journey, and is himself guilty of all the 'incongruities' for which he makes Chaucer responsible.

So far we find that no departure has been made from the order given by the MSS. The first note of the new criticism was sounded by J. Dixon in *Notes and Queries*<sup>10</sup> for 1865, where he asks if the tales 'could not be rearranged.'

<sup>5</sup> See Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, i, 269.

<sup>6</sup> Lounsbury, *l.c.*, p. 270 f.

<sup>7</sup> *The Canterbury Tales* ed. Tyrwhitt, London, 1775-8, and several times reprinted.

<sup>8</sup> *Canterbury Tales*, ed. Thomas Wright, Percy Society, nos. 24, 25, 26; see first vol., pp. xv-xxiii.

<sup>9</sup> *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*, 4th ed., London, 1865, pp. 209-214; this chapter was first delivered as a lecture at Canterbury in 1855 (cf. p. 16).

<sup>10</sup> *Notes and Queries*, 3 s., viii, p. 13.



The answer to this was given by F. J. Furnivall,<sup>11</sup> 1868,—an answer that is good, as far as it goes, for all time. Some of the most valuable parts of the work are due to Mr. Henry Bradshaw,—for which Furnivall freely gives him credit. Furnivall clearly arranges all the evidence, changes the manuscript order by restoring some displaced tales to their proper positions, and gives an order that is at present accepted as being the most satisfactory solution possible.

J. Koch, 1890, in an essay on *The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings*<sup>12</sup> gives several pages to the arrangement in the *Canterbury Tales*. He says (p. 54);—

"The results of Dr. Furnivall's researches in this respect are very valuable indeed; but as some few doubts remain, it is better to enter upon a new investigation than simply to follow his explanations."

Now as a matter of fact Koch in no way solves these 'doubts,' but merely amuses himself—and the reader—by guessing. His meaning is not always perfectly clear, and he seems to agree with Furnivall after all, except in the division of time.

Henry Morley,<sup>13</sup> 1890, considers the question at second hand, in a rambling way that claims scarcely a moment's attention.

The opinion of Ten Brink,<sup>14</sup> 1893, has already been quoted; he merely accepts the *tales* as they are given in the most careful MSS.

Skeat,<sup>15</sup> 1894, brings the list to a close; he adopts almost without variation the work presented by Furnivall, but states the case with great clearness and simplicity. In one instance he objects to a change made by Furnivall and falls back on the order of the MSS.

<sup>11</sup> *A Temporary Preface to the Six-Text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, Pt. I*, London, 1868 (Chauc. Soc. Second Series, no. 3). See also Warton's *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, ed. Hazlitt, London, 1871, vol. ii, p. 379.

<sup>12</sup> Published (with additional notes by Skeat and an occasional remark by Furnivall) for the Chaucer Society, 1890, Second Series, no. 27.

<sup>13</sup> *English Writers*, vol. v, 1890.

<sup>14</sup> *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, ii, Bd., Strassburg, 1893. The first part of vol. ii was published in Berlin, 1889; English translation of the latter by Robinson, New York, 1893.

<sup>15</sup> *The Complete Work of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. W. W. Skeat, Oxford, 1894, vol. iii, p. 371 f., and vol. v. This is commonly known as the *Oxford Chaucer*.

## II. STAGES OF THE JOURNEY.

The allusions to time and place are so scattered and incidental, that it is impossible to make out the author's scheme with any certainty, but a reasonable degree of probability must be admitted.

The theory of a one day's journey was for a long time tacitly accepted as a matter of course. Tyrwhitt, with his usual acuteness, noticed that many difficulties could be avoided by taking more than one day for the journey, but he contented himself with only a suggestion.<sup>16</sup> Long after the notion of a one-day's journey had been completely disproved, Morley came forward with it,<sup>17</sup> and Skeat, in the fifth volume of the *Oxford Chaucer* (which has just appeared), seems carelessly to admit its possibility.<sup>18</sup> Aside from the spirit of the whole composition, a little arithmetic is all that is needed to show how ridiculous such a supposition is. Allowing twelve hours for travelling, each pilgrim would have but little over twenty minutes in which to tell his story while jolting along at the rate of five miles an hour;—not time enough for reading it! No further thought need be given to this theory.

References to time in the text require at least two mornings;

Lo, Depeford l and it is half-way pryme,  
A 3906<sup>19</sup> (*Miller's Tale*).

and,

And seyde, 'sires, now in the morwe-tyde  
Out of your hostelrye I saugh you ryde.  
G 588 (*Canon's Yeoman's Prol.*)

The other two references to morning, 'it is pryme,' F 73 (*Squire's Tale*), and 'ten of the

<sup>16</sup> *Cant. Tales*, 1822, iv, 324.

<sup>17</sup> *Eng. Writers*, v, 310 f.

<sup>18</sup> "If, as Mr. Furnivall supposes, the time of the telling of the *Canterbury Tales* be taken to be longer than one day, we may suppose the *Man-of-Lawes* tale to begin the stories told on the *second* morning of the journey, April 18. Otherwise, we must suppose all the stories in Group A to precede it, which is not impossible, if we suppose the pilgrims to have started early in the morning." *Oxford Chaucer*, v, 132. This paragraph is all the more remarkable because such an admission directly opposes the position Skeat has taken elsewhere. See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 375, and v, 415.

<sup>19</sup> All references are to the text of the *Oxford Chaucer*, where the numbering is that of the *Six-Text Edition*.



clocke,' B 14 (*Man of Law's ProL.*), may refer to other mornings, but do not necessarily.<sup>20</sup>

B 14 goes very well with A 3906; and F 73, with G 588. Now allowing only two days, the reference in the *Canon's Yeoman's Prologue* would leave forty-six miles for the first day, hardly an improvement on the one-day theory, so we must admit at least three mornings or two days and one half. This is the scheme Koch adopts,<sup>21</sup> making the pilgrims travel thirty miles the first day, sixteen the second, and ten the third. Furnivall had already thought of this but rejected it in favor of three and one half days,<sup>22</sup> and Skeat follows Furnivall.<sup>23</sup>

This plan is the most probable one, and is to be adopted for the following reasons.

1. It presents fewer difficulties in arranging the tales.

2. It makes an almost equal division of the distance.

3. Records of contemporary journeys between London and Canterbury not requiring haste, give very strong confirmatory evidence and may be said to settle the question. From the records of the journeys<sup>24</sup> of Queen Isabella in 1358, and of King John of France in 1360, we find that to travel from London to Canterbury required between three and four days, and that the usual places for spending the night were Dartford, Rochester, and Ospringe. On looking at much later journeys,<sup>25</sup> that of Henry VIII and Charles V of Germany in 1522, and the journey of Anne of Cleves on her way to marry Henry VIII in 1540, we find that the rate of travel remained unchanged and the old stopping-places were still used.

On this evidence we are justified in assuming Chaucer's plan to have been as follows:—

*First day:* travel from Southwark to Dartford, fifteen miles, and spend the night.

*Second day:* arrive at Rochester, fifteen miles from Dartford, and spend the second night.

<sup>20</sup> Skeat has this very confusedly and, indeed, quite erroneously stated; *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 376.

<sup>21</sup> *l. c.*, p. 62 f.

<sup>22</sup> See Koch, *l. c.*, p. 59 n. 2, and *Temporary Preface*.

<sup>23</sup> *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 376, and v, 415.

<sup>24</sup> *Archæologia*, xxxv, 461; Stanley *Hist. Mem.*, p. 237; *Temp. Pref.*, pp. 13-15; *Oxford Chaucer*, v, 415.

<sup>25</sup> See Koch, *l. c.*, p. 79; the note is by Furnivall.

*Third Day:* stop for dinner at Sittingbourne (like King John) after traveling ten miles, and spend the night at Ospringe, six miles farther on, forty-six miles from London.

*Fourth day:* travel the remaining ten miles and reach Canterbury.

### III. ORDER OF THE TALES.

The *Canterbury Tales* is made up of fragments, that is, of groups of tales which are so joined by references in the text that they cannot be separated ('inseparably linked,' to use Tyrwhitt's phrase), while the groups themselves are not directly connected. There are nine of these fragments, but the group headed by the *Knight's Tale* comes first, and there is no doubt that the *Parson's Tale* comes last, so only seven groups are left for us to arrange. Allusions to places on the road and to the time of day, or references to preceding tales, are the chief means for bridging over the gaps between the groups and determining the intended order. The first group is composed of the *General Prologue*, and the tales of the Knight, Miller, Reeve, and Cook, and the *Cook's Tale* is unfinished, thus leaving this group unconnected with any other. As we have seen, the first night was probably spent at Dartford, and when the Reeve began his story at half-past seven in the morning, they were no farther than Greenwich, five miles from London (A 3906-7), so Chaucer evidently intended some stories more for the first day. Furnivall suggests that Chaucer meant to insert here the tales of some at least 'of the five City-Mechanics and the Ploughman'; Skeat thinks that the *Yeoman's Tale* (never written) was to have formed part of this group,<sup>26</sup> arguing this very cleverly from the fitness for a Yeoman of the non-Chaucerian *Tale of Gamelyn*, which so many MSS. insert after the *Cook's Tale*.

Now the Man of Law mentions ten o'clock in the morning, so Furnivall puts his story next in order on the following morning.<sup>27</sup> To Bradshaw belongs the credit of the next step. At the end of the *Man of Law's Tale* occur a few lines, in which a rude fellow pushes aside

<sup>26</sup> *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 377 and 380-1.

<sup>27</sup> Almost all the MSS. have this order;—Hengwrt, Trin. Coll. Oxf. 49, Christ Ch. 152 have not.

the Parson and volunteers a story of his own. Most MSS. call this rude fellow the 'Squire,' some of them read the 'Sompnour,' and one (Arch. Seld. B 14) has the 'Shipman.' This, says Mr. Bradshaw, is right; these lines are the *Shipman's Prologue*; such language and behavior would be altogether inappropriate for the Squire, and the *Sompnour's Prologue* and *Tale* are both complete. Tyrwhitt had noticed this,<sup>28</sup> and has already prefixed these lines to the *Shipman's Tale* in his edition. Mr. Bradshaw goes a step further. The Man of Law said;—

I can right now no thrifty tale seyn,  
B 46,

and the third line of this *Shipman's Prologue* reads,

This was a thrifty tale for the nones!  
B 1165.

thus linking these lines to the *Man-of-Law's Tale*; so that the *Prologue* cannot be moved up to the *Tale*; but the *Tale* must be placed after the *Prologue*, which thus links it to the *Man-of-Law's Tale*.

A geographical reference proves that this is the proper place for the group headed by the *Shipman's Tale*. A line in the *Monk's Prologue* refers to Rochester (B 3116), and Rochester is the next large town after Greenwich on the road to Canterbury.

This change also does away with the inconsistency of having a mention of Sittingbourne (in the *Sompnour's Tale*) precede that of Rochester, as is demanded by all the MSS.; Sittingbourne is ten miles farther on the road. With the *Shipman's Tale* must be brought up the whole group with which it is connected, so we have the tales of the Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibe, Monk, and Nun's Priest following in order the tale of the Man of Law. This would bring the pilgrims to Rochester, the end of the second day's journey (according to Furnivall), thirty miles from London.

Koch's order does not differ from the sequence that has been given above, but puts all these stories on the first day and makes Rochester the stopping-place for the first night.

This order of the tales is not altogether satisfactory to me, and I would place the

Doctor-Pardoner group before the *Man-of-Law's Tale* on the morning of the second day, which, I think, is its intended place. It is first necessary to do away with a textual difficulty.

The Shipman promises to tell a tale that shall 'waken al this companye,'

But it schal nat ben of philosophye,  
Ne *physices*, ne termes queinte of lawe.  
B 1188-9.

The word 'physices' is Skeat's reading, and he says in a foot-note to l. 1189,

"Tyrwhitt has of *physike*; the MSS. have the unmeaning word *phislyas* (Sloane *phillyas*; Ln. *fisleas*); read *physices*."

In his note on this line<sup>29</sup> he says further:—

"It is plain that the unmeaning words *phislyas* and *phillyas*, as in the MSS., must be corruptions of some difficult form. I think that form is certainly *physices*, with reference to the Physics of Aristotle, here conjoined with 'philosophy' and 'law' in order to include the chief forms of medieval learning. Aristotle was only known, in Chaucer's time, in Latin translations, and *Physices Liber* would be a possible title for such a translation. Lewis and Short's Lat. Dict. gives '*physica*, gen. *physicæ*, and *physice*, gen. *physices*, f., = *φυσική*, natural science, natural philosophy, physics.' . . . . .

That Chaucer should use the gen. *physices* alone, is just in his usual manner; cf. *Iudicum*, B. 3236; *Eneidos*, B. 4549; *Metamorphoseos*, B. 93. Tyrwhitt's reading of *physike* gives the same sense."

All these words might have been spared; they are wide of the mark. An examination of all the MSS. in which this line occurs<sup>30</sup> shows seven readings; this *Prologue* is wanting in the so-called edited texts.

1. *phislyas*: MS. Arch. Seld. B. 14.  
Corp. (Oxford) MS.  
Royal MS. 8 C ii.  
Lichfield MS.
- physlyas*: MS. I i. 3. 26. Camb. Univ. Lib.
- fyslyas*: Royal MS. 17 D xv.
- fisleas*: Lansdowne MS. 851.
2. *phislays*: Laud MS. 739.
3. *phillyas*: Sloane MS. 1685.
- philyas*: Barlow MS. 20.
- philyas*: Sloane MS. 1686.

<sup>29</sup> Oxford Chaucer, v, p. 167.

<sup>30</sup> See the print of the *Shipman's Prologue* in the *Six-Text Edition*.

<sup>28</sup> 'Intr. Discourse,' § xxxi.



4. *phisilias*: Harl. MS. 7333.  
 Rawl. MS. Misc. 1133.  
 Trin. Coll. Cambr. MS. R. 3.3.  
*physilias*: Helmingham MS.  
 5. *phisicians*: Camb. Univ. Libr. MS. Mm 2 5.  
 6. *phisik*: Hatton MS. 1.  
 Trin. Coll. Cambr. MS. R. 215.  
*physik*: Rawl. MS. Poet. 141.  
*fysike*: Rawl. MS. Poet. 149.  
 7. *Ne speke no termes* &c. MS. Harl. 1758.

It will be seen from this table that there is a form 'phislyas' (> 'phillyas' by assimilation) or 'phisilias,' which occurs too persistently to be cast aside as 'unmeaning,' although it was evidently not a very familiar word. One scribe did not understand it at all and changed the reading of the line; another substituted the common word 'phisicians,' while four read 'phisik.' Regarding merely the probabilities of the question, the meaning of the word would seem to be thus indicated; the interpretation is too consistent to be called a blunder. But we may go further than this; the Epinal, the Erfurt, and the Corpus Glossaries<sup>31</sup> all have the gloss, 'phisillos: *leceas*'; which establishes with comparative certainty both the form and the meaning. Now 'phisillos' is not a classical word and is presumably a corrupt form;<sup>32</sup> I have not yet been able to find an occurrence of it later than these glossaries, which belong to the eighth and ninth centuries, but Hessels says:<sup>33</sup>—

"An examination of the Corpus Glossary brings out the fact that, though there is an interval of eight centuries between it and the *Catholicon Anglicum*, which is dated 1483, both these glossaries, written in England, stand in precisely the same stage with regard to deviations from the classical spelling of

<sup>31</sup> See Sweet's *Oldest Eng. Texts*, p. 84 & p. 87, and *An Eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, ed. by J. H. Hessels, Cambridge, 1890, p. 93.

<sup>32</sup> Wülcker (*Vocabularies*, 39, 21), Sweet, and Diefenbach think it is for 'physicos' (-us). Skeat's identification with 'physica' or 'physice'—natural science is, of course, not to be thought of; the gloss alone is sufficient proof against this meaning, but Skeat has also looked into the wrong dictionary! In Late Latin the classical meaning of *physicus* and *physica* seems to be completely lost, and we have only *physicus* = 'medicus,' *physica* = 'medicina.' See Du Cange, s. v. *Carpentier*, &c.

<sup>33</sup> *l. c.* Introduction, p. xx.

Latin caused by pronunciation, and changes caused by misreadings of certain letters."

This, then, gives us good reason to carry the form 'phisillos' into Chaucer's time—the slightly differing manuscript readings are quite natural—and the old glossaries together with the scribal interpretations leave little room to doubt that its meaning is 'physician' or 'physic.'

We may now take up the question of the proper place for the Doctor-Pardoner group, which I place before the *Man-of-Law's Tale*<sup>34</sup> for the following reasons.

1. The *Shipman's Prologue* closes with these lines:

My Ioly body shal a tale telle,  
 And I shal clinken yow so mery a belle,  
 That I shal waken al this companye;  
 But it shal nat ben of philosophye,  
 Ne *phislyas*,<sup>35</sup> ne termes queinte of lawe;  
 Ther is but litel Latin in my mawe.

B 1185-90.

Now 'phislyas' and 'termes queinte of lawe' seem to point directly at the Doctor, and the Man of Law, and 'of philosophy' very fitly characterises the *Pardoner's Tale*; in fact, the *Pardoner's Tale* is the only one of these that could be called 'philosophical' even in a loose sense. It is evidently the intention of the Shipman to compare the story he shall tell with those that have already been told on that morning, and here we find a distinct reference to each of them; denying the reference, we have no good reason for the collocation. And furthermore, the *Pardoner's Prologue* and *Tale* are demanded to give point to the line,

Ther is but litel Latin in my mawe.

For, although the Doctor and the Man of Law, as well as the Pardoner, mentioned Latin authors by name, the Pardoner is the only one who uses any Latin quotation. He takes as his text 'Radix malorum est Cupidi-

<sup>34</sup> Koch (*l. c.*, p. 59) suggests that Chaucer 'had planned to insert one or two more tales before the Man-of-Law's, or rather between this one and the Shipman's, perhaps the Doctor's and the Pardoner's.' The latter alternative is, of course, impossible; the link between the *Man of Law* and the *Shipman* cannot be broken. Koch does not make a point of this suggestion and gives it up (p. 60) as lightly as he has brought it forward.

<sup>35</sup> The most common manuscript reading.



das; ' he quotes this twice (C 334 and C 426), and also boasts that he can speak in Latin (C 344).

2. This position of the Doctor-Pardoner group would give a decidedly better application to the Host's remark<sup>36</sup> in the *Man-of-Law's End-link (Shipman's Prologue)*,—

I see wel that ye lerned men in lore  
Can moche good, by goddes dignitee!  
B 1168-9.

for the Host would then refer not only to the Man of Law and the Parson, but also to the Doctor and the Pardoner.<sup>37</sup>

3. The morning hour<sup>38</sup> required by the place I have given this group, fits in very well with two references.<sup>39</sup> After the quarrel between the Host and the Pardoner, the Knight, acting as peace-maker, called upon them to kiss, and laugh, and play as before; and the poet adds,

Anou they kiste, and riden forth hir weye.  
C 968.

This, as Furnivall says,<sup>40</sup> sounds more like the

<sup>36</sup> Koch, *l. c.*, p. 59, gives this as the ground for his suggestion which has already been quoted.

<sup>37</sup> Skeat thinks the Pardoner would not be called 'a lerned man in lore,' for 'the proof that this is the very last title the Host would have bestowed on the Pardoner, is given in C 942-968, where the Host's contempt of the Pardoner is expressed in the strongest terms which he could command.' See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 419. Tyrwhitt ('Intr. Discourse', § xxxi) and Koch (*l. c.*, p. 59) saw no inconsistency in such a title, and they are right; Skeat has not read his text attentively enough. It is true that the Host had expressed his contempt of the Pardoner in no measured terms, and the Pardoner became too angry for speech; then the Host said,

— 'I wol no longer pleye  
With thee, ne with noon other angry man.'  
C. 958-9.

This makes it evident that the Host was only joking,—and the Pardoner himself began it all by offering to let the Host kiss the relics first because he was 'most envoluped in sinne.'

The Pardoner might well be included among the 'lerned men' on account of his Latin quotations and his philosophical discourse, and the following lines from the *General Prologue* (A 709 f.) show that Chaucer intended us to have such an idea:

But trewely to tellen, atte laste,  
He was in chirche a noble ecclesiaste.  
Wel coude he rede a lessoun or a storie,  
But alderbest he song an offertorie.

<sup>38</sup> The *Man-of-Law's Prologue* mentions ten o'clock.

<sup>39</sup> Furnivall uses these references to fix this group on the third morning.

<sup>40</sup> *Temp. Pref.*, p. 27.

beginning than the end of a day's journey and naturally points to a morning hour.

Then, when the Host calls on the Pardoner for his story, he says he will first stop 'at this ale-stake,' and will 'both drinke, and eten of a cake' (C 321-2). Furnivall says;<sup>41</sup>—

"This bite on the cake and draught of ale leave no doubt on my mind that the Pardoner wanted a snack, by way of breakfast, before telling his tale; and that before-dinner suits the circumstances much better than after; for if he had had a hearty meal at 9 or 10, after a morning's ride, he would not have wanted a luncheon between that and supper at 4 or 5. A draught of ale he might have felt the need of, but the bite on a cake means before-breakfast."

I think Mr. Furnivall makes a trifle too much of this incident; the Pardoner was evidently a man to whom a bottle of beer and a 'cracker' (transferring the scene to nineteenth-century America) were never out of place. This may be taken, though, as evidence, for what it is worth.

4. There is no other evidence in the Doctor-Pardoner group as to its place among the other groups, and there is absolutely nothing that conflicts with the position I have assigned to it, while all the evidence we have sustains this grouping.<sup>42</sup>

I think, then, we may write down the order; Knight—Miller—Reeve—Cook; . . . . . Doctor-Pardoner; Man of Law; Shipman—Prioress—Sir Thopas—Melibe—Monk—Nun's Priest.

We have now followed the pilgrims to Rochester, where they must have spent the night. What then was the first story told in the morning? Furnivall puts the Doctor-Pardoner group here on account of the references to a morning hour, but we have already found a better place for this group. Koch says we may also put the Squire-Franklin group here, letting it precede the *Doctor's Tale*, although he does not insist upon this change. I

<sup>41</sup> *Temp. Pref.*, p. 25.

<sup>42</sup> It has already been mentioned that Skeat objects in one instance to the order given by Furnivall; it is in regard to the position of the Doctor-Pardoner group. No good, he says, has been effected by its removal and it should be left after the *Franklin's Tale*, where it is found in the best MSS. He has been forced to follow Furnivall's arrangement, but notes that the right order of the groups is: A, B, D, E, F, C, G, H, I. See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 434.

shall presently show that the last morning of the journey is the proper place for this group. The fragment headed by the Wife of Bath is the one we must next bring up; it is called for by a geographical allusion. The Sompnour refers twice to Sittingbourne (D 845 f. and 2294), and as this is the next important town after Rochester, this is certainly the place for the stories of the Wife of the Bath, the Friar, and the Sompnour, which are 'inseparably linked.' Sittingbourne is only ten miles from Rochester, not enough for a day's journey, so Furnivall suggests<sup>43</sup> that the pilgrims merely halted there for dinner. Now the tales of the Clerk and the Merchant form altogether another group, although most of the MSS. separate them. There is however a link connecting these tales<sup>44</sup> which was observed by the scribes of the 'edited MSS.,' and was made still stronger by their insertion of some connecting lines. This is the link; the *Clerk's Tale* ends with the line,

And lat him care, and wepe, and wringe, and waille!  
E 1212.

and the first line of the *Merchant's Prologue* is,

Weping and wayling, care, and other sorwe.  
E 1213.

The Merchant also mentions 'Grisildis grete pacience' (E 1224), showing that the *Clerk's Tale* is fresh in his mind.<sup>45</sup>

The Clerk plainly refers to the story told by the Wife of Bath;

For which heer, for the wyves love of Bathe,  
Whos lyf and al hir secte god mayntene  
In heigh maistrise,— E 1170-2.

and the Merchant mentions the fact that she has already told her story;

The Wyf of Bathe, if ye han understonde,  
Of mariage, which we have on honde  
Declared hath ful wel in litel space.  
E 1685-7.

So it is clear, then, that this group was meant to follow the group headed by the Wife of Bath, most likely on the same day, and probably immediately after leaving Sittingbourne. This position is strengthened by a line which,

<sup>43</sup> *Temp. Pref.*, p. 25.

<sup>44</sup> 'As strong a link as any in the whole work,' says Furnivall, *Temp. Pref.*, p. 27.

<sup>45</sup> See Tyrwhitt, 'Intr. Discourse,' § xxi.

I believe, has not yet been noticed. The Host is speaking:—

'Sir clerk of Oxenford,' our hoste sayde,  
'Ye ryde as coy and stille as dooth a mayde,  
Were newe spoused, sitting at the bord;  
This day ne herde I of your tonge a word.'

E 1-4

If the hour were early morning, the Host would not say he had not heard the Clerk speak a word 'this day;' a considerable part of the day must have passed, and after dinner at Sittingbourne gives the required situation.

These five stories are the only ones that may be assigned to the third day's journey—a very small allotment,—but some of the unwritten stories would doubtless have found a place here. From this point the incompleteness of the *Canterbury Tales* becomes more and more evident, and this very fact is in some sort a guarantee for the genuineness of our scheme; defects are found just where they ought to be in such a work,—in the latter part. According to Furnivall's scheme the night after the third day's journey is spent at Ospringe. The *Canon's Yeoman's Prologue* mentions Boughton-under-Blean and intimates that the night's resting-place was just five miles to the rear; measuring back we get Ospringe, which was one of the usual stopping-places between London and Canterbury.

This brings us to the last day's journey, and we must decide, if possible upon the first story told on the fourth morning.

The Squire-Franklin group stands unlinked to any other and has the following reference to time:

I wol nat tarien yow, for it is pryme,  
F 73.

So Furnivall answers the question with this group, but he seems to have no reason for putting it on this particular morning. Koch thinks the morning of the preceding day would do just as well. It is to be noted, however, that when the Doctor-Pardoner group and the group headed by the Shipman are moved to their proper places, the Squire-Franklin group will fall in the very order Furnivall has chanced upon; and this is the order I think we can sustain with some reason.

Let us examine the opening lines of the



*Franklin's Tale* (F 729-802); the passage is too long to quote entire. After 'many a labour, many a greet emprise,' a worthy knight is accepted as husband by a lady of 'heigh kinrede.' He swore 'of his free wil' never to take upon himself any 'maistrye agayn hir wil,' keeping only the name of 'soverayne-tee;' and she, not to be outdone in generosity, vowed ever to be his 'humble trewe wyf.' This mutual trust and obedience, continues the Franklin, is the only true basis of marriage as well as of love. Love will not be 'constreyned by maistrye,' it is free as a spirit; and women desire liberty as well as men. Yet

Pacience is an heigh vertu certeyn;  
For it venquisseth, as thise clerkes seyn,<sup>46</sup>  
Thinges that rigour sholde never atteyne.

Patience is also necessary, for there is no one in the world 'that he ne dooth or seith somtyme amis'; so she promised the knight that he should never find her wanting in 'suffrance,' and thus took him for 'hir servant and hir lord,'

Servant in love, and lord in mariage.

The stories of the wife of Bath and of the Clerk also treat of the relation of man and wife. The Clerk shows that the most patient, unquestioning obedience of a wife to the most capricious and unjust demands of her husband, is finally rewarded; and such a woman is held up as an example to womankind. The Wife of Bath takes the opposite view; she says that the chief desire and delight of woman is to have the upper hand 'as wel over hir housbond as hir love,' and prays that

Iesu shorte hir lyves  
That wol nat be governed by hir wyves.

Now the Franklin, as we have seen, discusses both these views and shows the limitations of each. The key-note of the Wife-of-Bath's story is 'mastery,' and of the Clerk's 'patience;' the Franklin uses these two words repeatedly and contrasts them with great nicety, taking a measure of each for his own conception of married life, which is a much higher conception than the Wife's or the Clerk's. The natural inference of all this is that the Franklin's story was meant to come

<sup>46</sup> See *Oxford Chaucer*, v. p. 388, for sources of the quotation.

after the other two; not to admit this would be to accuse Chaucer of a gross artistic blunder.

Then, too, the Franklin uses some phrases seemingly with conscious reference to the words of the Wife of Bath. She says (in the person of the knight, who is speaking):

'Wommen desyren to have sovereyntee  
As wel over hir housbond as hir love,  
And for to been in maistrie him above;  
This is your moste desyr.'—

D 1038-41.

These lines contain the point of the whole story; up to this time everything has been in suspense. Compare with this the following quotations from the Franklin:

Of his free wil he swoor hir as a knight,  
That never in al his lyf he, day ne night,  
Ne sholde up-on him take no maistrye.

Save that the name of soveraynetee,  
That wolde he have for shame of his degree.

F 745-7 and 751-2.

Love wol nat ben constreyned by maistrye;  
Whan maistrie comth, the god of love anon  
Beceth hise winges, and farewell! he is gon!<sup>47</sup>

F 764-6.

Thus hath she take hir servant and hir lord,  
Servant in love, and lord in mariage.

F 792-3.

The wording is in some points remarkably similar, but the connection in thought is still closer; it is hard to deny that the Franklin intentionally refers to the Wife's story, after carefully reading his introductory passage. Still, even if this be not so, we could not place the *Franklin's Tale* before the Wife-of-Bath's; to do this would be to anticipate the point of her story and take away the telling effect of the denouement. We may then with reason demand that the Squire-Franklin group be placed after the *Wife's Tale*, and, consequently, after the tales of the Clerk and the Merchant also.

Now the Wife-Friar-Sompnour group was told just before reaching Sittingbourne, presumably after considerable travel, and the Clerk probably began his story soon after leaving town, so the *Squire's Tale*, with its mention of 'pryme,' could not come on this day. There is only one place left for it,—the next morning, and we may now with some

<sup>47</sup> This passage seems to be founded on some lines in *Le Roman de la Rose*. See *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 388.



confidence begin the last day's story-telling with the Squire-Franklin group.<sup>48</sup>

The remaining groups may be disposed of in few words. The group composed of the *Second Nun's* and the *Canon's Yeoman's Tales* must come next; the situation is fully given in the link (G 554-719): the time is morning and the place is 'Boughton under Blee,'<sup>49</sup> only a few miles from Canterbury.

The *Manciple's Tale* is unconnected with the Canon's Yeoman's, but must follow it closely on account of its mention of 'Bob-up-and-down,' which is usually identified with Harbledown, the next place to Boughton on the road to Canterbury. There seems to be little doubt of this identification although it has given rise to much dispute.<sup>50</sup>

The only story left is the Parson's, which seems at first to be inseparably linked to the Manciple's; the first line of the *Parson's Prologue* reads:—

By that the maunciple hadde his tale al ended.

Then follows the time of day and an exact description of the shadow then cast; some of the MSS. have ten o'clock, some two, one five, but most of the best MSS. have four;<sup>51</sup> this latter hour alone can be right, as is conclusively shown by the length of the shadow given for that time. So there is, after all, a break between the *Manciple's Tale*, which

<sup>48</sup> Ten Brink and Morley still hold that the tales of the Clerk, Merchant, Squire, and Franklin form one group. There is no good reason for thus connecting them. See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, p. 462. Ten MSS. use the Squire-Franklin link for the prologue to the *Merchant's Tale*. See *Six-Text Ed.*, p. xii.\*

<sup>49</sup> See *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 416, and notes in other editions of the *Canterbury Tales*. A. S. Cook in MOD. LANG. NOTES, March, 1893, col. 129, notes that Boughton under Blean 'seems to have been used as a sort of proverbial expression.' For the good or bad character of Boughton, see *Athenaeum* for 1868, p. 886 (also *Temp. Pref.*, p. 31, n. 2), for 1869, p. 350; *Notes and Queries* 4 s., iv, p. 509; 4 s., v, p. 71; 4 s., v, p. 159.

<sup>50</sup> See the following references for a discussion of Bob-up-and-down: Tyrwhitt, 'Intr. Discourse,' § xxxix; Wright, *Cant. Tales*, iii, p. 63, n.; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 435; Furnivall, *Temp. Pref.*, p. 31, n. 2; Morley, *English Writers*, v, 344; *Notes and Queries*, 3 s., viii, p. 13; 4 s., iv, p. 509; 4 s., v, p. 71; 4 s., v, p. 159; *Athenaeum* for 1868, pp. 535, 612, 652, 724, 886, and for 1869, p. 350.

<sup>51</sup> See Tyrwhitt, 'Intr. Discourse,' § xli; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 444.

was told in the morning,<sup>52</sup> and the *Parson's Tale*, which must be dated four o'clock in the afternoon.

I must agree with Furnivall<sup>53</sup> that 'either the Manciple's name must have been introduced by a copier after Chaucer's death, or that Chaucer himself had not revised this link or prologue so as to remove the contradiction.'

The *Parson's Tale* was meant to close the series of stories told on the journey to Canterbury; nothing is said anywhere about the return journey, and the theory that any of the existing tales were intended for it, is now so generally discarded that it need be only mentioned.<sup>54</sup> We may then definitely assign six tales to the last day: those of the Squire, the Franklin, the Second Nun, the Canon's Yeoman, the Manciple, and the Parson. This makes our list complete and leaves seven pilgrims that have not taken part in the story-telling,—the Yeoman, the Haberdasher, the Carpenter, the Weaver, the Dyer, the Tapicer, and the Plowman.

To review:—

1. The orders<sup>55</sup> of MSS. of the Ellesmere type, adopted by Tyrwhitt, is:
  - A. Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook.
  - Ba. Man of Law.
  - D. Wife of Bath, Friar, Sompnour.
  - E. Clerk, Merchant.
  - F. Squire, Franklin.
  - C. Doctor, Pardoner.
  - Bb. Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibeus, Monk, Nun's Priest.
  - G. Second Nun, Canon's Yeoman.
  - H. Manciple.
  - I. Parson.
2. Furnivall:—A, Ba Bb, C, D, E, F, G, H,
  - I. Three changes in sequence:
    - a. Bb to follow Ba,—demanded by B 46 and B 1165 (Bradshaw).
    - b. C to precede D,—mostly arbitrary.

<sup>52</sup> That the *Manciple's Tale* belongs to the morning, is indicated by the scene described in the *Manciple's Prologue*; Furnivall shows that this might have happened any time before twelve o'clock (*Temp. Pref.*, pp. 34-6).

<sup>53</sup> *Temp. Pref.*, p. 36.

<sup>54</sup> Ten Brink still holds that the *Manciple's Tale* was probably intended for the beginning of the journey home.

<sup>55</sup> For the sake of convenience I take Furnivall's order as the norm.

- c. F then precedes G,—position not established.
3. Koch:—A, Ba, [C?], Bb, [F?], C, D, E, F, G, H, I—suggests some change, but seems finally to agree with Furnivall.
  4. Skeat:—A, Ba Bb, D, E, F, C, G, H, I—objects to arbitrary changes and falls back upon the MSS.
  5. The Scheme I think will hold is:—A, C, Ba Bb, D, E, F, G, H, I.
    - a. That C precedes B is indicated by B 1185-90.
    - b. That F follows D and E is implied by a comparison of F 729-802 with the *Wife's Tale* and the *Clerk's Tale*, and (specifically) of F 745-7, 751-2, 764-6, 792-3, with D 1038-41.

This scheme links together for the first time all of the *Canterbury Tales*; and it is a remarkable fact that we can find any consistent plan in a work so incomplete. Chaucer had evidently well thought out nearly every detail.

GEORGE SHIPLEY.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

#### FRENCH DRAMA.

*Ruy Blas* par VICTOR HUGO. Edited with introduction and explanatory notes by SAMUEL GARNER, Ph. D., Department of Modern Languages, U. S. Naval Academy. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1894.

VICTOR HUGO's *Ruy Blas* is one of those plays, of which an edition for college students, and for students of French literature in general, was an imperative need, and it is a pleasure to record the judgment that Dr. Garner has fulfilled his task in a most satisfactory and scholarly manner. The edition before us is one of which nothing but good can be said from cover to cover.

*Ruy Blas* is not a play which will ordinarily be placed in the hands of beginners, and the whole critical apparatus of the edition is therefore addressed primarily to the advanced student of French literature. It is a pleasure to see so sober and dignified a handling of annotations as that of Dr. Garner; the notes are refreshingly free from that over-anno-

tation which has become such a burden in so many of our present text-books, and, be it said parenthetically, to which students rarely refer except when they are on the point of a failure in the class-room.

Hugo's plays will not generally be read for the sole purpose of impressing the rules of French syntax; an editor of these texts must therefore bear in mind the needs of the student, who is to gain through his reading a knowledge of Hugo, the man, as well as of Hugo the dramatist and the champion of the Romantic movement. In his preface Garner says, that between *Hernani* and *Ruy Blas* the latter has slightly the lead as a favorite, in that the poet has therein reached a higher plane of dramatical lyricism. This statement may be concurred in, and still it is evident, that any student who has read *Ruy Blas* and is ignorant of the interesting battle about *Hernani*, is still far from the understanding of the real nature of the Romantic Drama. That this is true, is shown by the edition before us, for in the introduction and notes there is scarcely a reference to the storm that preceded this calm. And still the omission cannot be construed into a serious criticism, for *Ruy Blas* does not represent the battle-ground, but the stronghold captured and beautified, and it must be treated as such.

All of Hugo's works are full of historical allusions and references to incidents and traditions of medieval lore which must be understood, otherwise the true meaning of many a significant passage is lost. This author differs in this respect from other writers; he is consciously medieval in his literary thinking, or he strives to be so; his aim is to resuscitate the past, and it therefore becomes the editor's duty to show in how far the author has been true to his purpose. But here peculiar difficulties at once present themselves. True literary greatness has perhaps never been coupled with a more absolute *terre-à-terre* conception of literary honesty and scientific charlatanism than in Hugo; nobody would be disposed to quarrel with him, had he used history for his literary purposes without making pretense to historical accuracy and without willfully beclouding the conceptions of his readers. The famous reference to the Chron-

icle of Alaya in the handbills distributed on the night of the first representation of *Hernani* ('qui ne doit pas être confondu avec Ayala, l'annaliste de Pierre le Cruel')!—a chronicle which Hugo himself had not seen any more than others endowed with less imagination, will make every annotator justly cautious of allowing himself to be deceived a second time. In fact Hugo browbeats his readers in this particular in such a bold-faced and bombastic manner, that it becomes a real delight to lay bare his foibles, and to show the number of instances, where he has juggled with historical data. In the present instance the field had been pretty well cleared by Morel-Fatio in his study entitled 'L'histoire dans Ruy Blas' in *Études sur l'Espagne*, first series, Paris, 1888. Garner has made excellent use of the material offered here. The Introduction in its general outline is based upon that article, and many an interesting point is aptly incorporated in its appropriate place in the body of the Notes. Hugo's historical inaccuracies are numerous in this play, but the greatest sin of all consists in having consciously perverted the historical facts in the case by endowing Maria Anna of Neuburg, the second wife of Charles II of Spain, with the gentle character of Marie-Louise d'Orléans his first wife, and this seemingly for no other reason than that he wanted the play to fall within the last decade of the seventeenth century, when Anna Maria of Neuburg was queen, and that the *Mémoires de Mme d'Aulnoy*, of which he made extensive use, speak only of Marie-Louise d'Orléans. This grave *escamotage* of history is seriously blamed by Morel-Fatio, and sufficiently emphasized in Garner's introduction; other substitutions of the same nature, such as that of the Camarera Mayor, follow naturally. Compared with this, that often quoted 'sans un maravedis de plus ou de moins' (from one of Hugo's own comments to l. 1018-19), is a venial sin, which no critic would mention seriously, but for Hugo's misleading boast of his historical accuracy. The editor's Introduction contains besides a short and helpful account of the 'Spanish Monarchy in the xvii century,' some paragraphs on the original suggestion and sources of the play

and on the principal characters: Don Salluste, Don César, Ruy Blas and Don Guritan.

The chapter on the Versification is on the whole clear and lucid, and still I doubt whether the average student will gain from it an accurate knowledge of the Alexandrine line. The terminology concerning rhymes is incomplete and misleading. If 'vowel rhyme' merely constitutes 'rime suffisante,' and agreement 'in sound both in their consonantal and vocal elements' makes 'rimes riches,' the student will be justified in classifying *gùdre: père, encor: Hector* (p. xx) as rich rhymes, and *inouï: ébloui* (359: 360) will seem sufficient or poor.

The Romantic line may be looked upon as having come about through overflow of the first hemistich, but it seems wrong to me to speak of a caesura after the ninth syllable. Either there is a caesura after the sixth syllable, and then we have three pauses and a classic line, or the pause after the sixth syllable is omitted and then we have two pauses and a romantic line. In the verse (p. xxii):

Son petit-fils, Pedro de Bazan, épousa  
Marianne de Gor

we have either two caesuras or none at all, and it seems to me, when speaking of the alexandrine verse, it is best not to take from the word caesura its accepted meaning; namely that of pause after the sixth syllable, and to call the variable caesuras pauses (Quicherat, *Versification française*, p. 11, uses *coupe* or *suspension*). When speaking of the two lines 3 and 7 of the illustrative extracts on p. xxii,

Jean, qui fut gén'ral de la mer océane, -

and

Vous, le comte  
De Garofa, Tous deux se valent, si l'on compte,

the editor makes the remark, "it is very questionable whether any pause is allowable after *général* and *deux*." Certainly there is no pause here in the sense of the classical caesura, but since he had gone so far, he should surely have gone one step further and added, that in this very particular Hugo, the master-workman of the romantic line, has admirably shown where the limit of the liberties taken with the classic alexandrine has been reached. However freely Hugo may



have distributed his pauses in the line, the sixth syllable is always important enough in sound or sense to notify the ear that the hemistich has been passed. Hugo would never have placed *de* or *se* in the sixth syllable.

An omission, which can easily be remedied in a second edition, is the absence of the date of the first representation of the play. There is nothing but the easily overlooked signature at the end of Hugo's *Préface* to indicate the year, and the student should be told that it was first played on Nov. 8, 1838, and that its first representation was not given in the Théâtre Français but in the Théâtre de la Renaissance.

The Notes are admirable in every respect. Their principal characteristic is that of suggesting rather than presenting ready-made solutions for difficult passages. Where translations appeared called for, a free idiomatic rendering is given, still leaving to the student the working out of the difficulty of the construction. Most of them throw light on historical allusions necessary for the understanding of the play, and for the laborious collection of these, the editor deserves the thanks of every teacher of French. Some of them contain particularly neat bits of information; as, for instance, l. 117, Act iii-i (écrivain-mayor des rentes), l. 1041, 1085 and 1946.

In a few instances, which are given below, we are inclined to differ from the editor: l. 80—The note ends by saying, 'the Plaza (Mayor) is now converted into a flower garden.' This note is due to a misleading sentence in Murray's *Handbook of Spain*. It is merely a public square with some flowerbeds and shrubbery.—l. 227. By *anciens preux*, it seems to me, are not meant ancient knights, but the reference is to the nine worthies (les anciens preux, cp. Littré, s. v.), so famous in the middle ages, of which there were three belonging to Jewish history (Joshua, David, Judas Maccabaeus), three to classical antiquity (Hector, Alexander, Julius Caesar) and three to the middle ages (Arthur, Charlemagne, Godfrey of Bouillon). The use of the article here speaks for this interpretation.—l. 521. I think the editor has here entirely missed the sense of the construction. In the paragraph in Littré, to which he refers, as well as in the

stage direction (l. 628), the accompanying accusative is the subject of the following infinitive (qui le laisse faire d'un air indifférent et distrait). But in *laissez-vous faire*, *laissez* is a reflexive verb, and the reflexive object is also the object of the following infinitive. For purposes of translation the infinitive may be considered as having passive meaning; *se laisser faire*=to allow oneself to be acted upon, to be led. Cp. the similar construction, *Hernani*, 365:

Donnez-vous aussi l'ordre au chef qui la commande  
De se laisser faire.

—l. 542. *Se valent*=are equal; add, are worth one as much as the other. This is one of the French idiomatic constructions presenting particular difficulties to English students and should be explained more at length. (Cp. the translation of Miss Rena Michaels in her edition of *Ruy Blas*, Holt & Co., 1886. Lit.= 'Both are worth' that is 'worth something,' sic!)—l. 565. 'A dansé d'une façon galante' does not mean 'did some pretty tall kicking,' but rather 'has danced with elegance.' Quite contrary to high kicking, the expression *danser d'une façon galante* makes one think of Mlle. de Bourbon's description of Voiture's dancing, who says in his letter to the Cardinal de la Valette (Crane, *Société franç.*, p. 50) 'Mlle. de Bourbon jugea qu'à la vérité je dansois mal, mais que je tirois bien des armes pour ce qu'à la fin de toutes les cadences il sembloit que je me misse en garde.—l. 677 It would be interesting to know upon what authority the editor has selected the definite date 1026 as the birth year of the Cid. It is usually given about 1040.—l. 964. The German Empire was dissolved on the sixth of August 1806, when Franz II abdicated the throne, and not in 1804.—l. 965. Finding that six hundred leagues is nearly double the actual distance between Madrid and Neuburg, the editor remarks that 'the distance both ways may be meant however.' But in l. 1869 Don Guritan says, after his return, 'J'ai fait douze cents lieues.'—l. 1358. When *que* in this peculiar idiomatic construction is mentioned at all, attention should be called to the fact that it serves to point out the subject.—l. 1862. The etymology of Spanish *hidalgo* as *FILIUS ITALICUS* was very well as a fancy of

Knapp's in his *Spanish Reader*, but it has never been taken seriously by any one else, and does not deserve to be resuscitated after Todd's review of Knapp's 'Etymologies,' *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, i, col. 285.—l. 1908. What is the purpose of a note on *païrez*, when the text (and so also the *édition définitive*) reads *païerez?*—l. 2196. Since good vigorous renderings of words like *pardieu* are forbidden by our laws of taste, would it not be better to omit the translation altogether rather than render it by the colorless *sounds*?

The following typographical errors were noted: p. v, l. 7, omit the comma between *master* and *mind*; p. 8 l. 1, change *hâton* to *hâtons*; l. 782 change *qu* to *qui*; l. 786 put a period after *Prions*; l. 861 change *Blesse* to *Blessé*; l. 1055 place an exclamation point after *Il a les nègres*; l. 1175 note the imperfect letter-press after *d'Harcourt*; l. 1200 the numeral stands a line too high; l. 1757 the *édition définitive* also writes *pâtenôtres*, but Littré, s. v., omits the first circumflex; the word appears correctly in the note; l. 2116 change *reste* to *rester*. In note 554 change *bon homme* to *bonhomme*. Note 1862, change *flius* to *filius*, or better omit altogether this part of the note. In the Appendix, act V, scène ii, l. 6, change *traître* to *traitre*.

In conclusion let it be said once more, that this edition is in every way a scholarly piece of work and a most welcome addition to our available text-books.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

#### ON THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE:

*Illustrations of how it is taught in a Much-Advertised Book, with a Few Critical Remarks.*

Now that so much has been written (in *The Dial* and elsewhere) on the subject of how English is taught in colleges and universities, it may not be amiss to say something about how it is taught or ought to be taught in the secondary schools. I shall not attempt to treat the subject generally or exhaustively, but merely throw out a few hints in connec-

tion with criticisms of a book to which I recently gave some attention.

I refer to Lockwood's *Lessons in English*; a book which has been widely recommended for use in high schools and academies, and is mentioned in some University catalogues among the books to be studied in preparing for entrance to these institutions. During the past summer I had occasion to use the book with a class of High-School Principals, and not finding it to be in all respects as excellent a work as I had been led to suppose, but that, on the contrary, it suffers from very grave defects, I have thought it worth while to point out some of these, the more so because the book is designed for use in secondary schools.

Of all text-books those intended for young students need to be the most carefully prepared, as to both contents and style. The book in question, however, cannot be said to fulfill these requirements. It is faulty not only as regards proportion and the selection of topics, but also in logic and grammar.

The book is "adapted to the study of American classics," and the greater part of it,—the introduction, containing suggestions on how to teach literature, and the chapters on rhetoric, composition, and biographical sketches,—is on the whole good. But the first chapter, which purports to be a history of the English language, deserves very little if any praise. It seems remarkable that the book has been so long before the public without being severely criticised in the matter of this chapter. The explanation is, perhaps, that those who may be the most competent to judge do not as a rule use the book in their classes. Instead of giving a comprehensive and connected history of the English language, which might have been done in a simple and interesting way, the author has prepared a chapter of scraps, which give it the character of a crazy quilt. Evidently the author has no thorough knowledge of the subject, not even enough to use discretion in the choice of authorities. Only on this supposition can one account for the many erroneous, not to say absurd, statements to be found in this chapter. A full criticism of all these shall of course not be attempted here.

Throughout the chapter the names "Saxon,"



"Anglo-Saxon," "Old English," and "English" are, without any good reason, used interchangeably. For example, on page 17 the author says that, "in time the dialect of the West Saxons became the language of literature and of law. This is what is known as *Old English*. Thus it happens that the language of the Teutonic invaders is called sometimes the *Anglo-Saxon*, sometimes the *Saxon*, and sometimes the *English*." Here "Old English" and "Anglo-Saxon" are used as convertible terms for the language of one and the same period. But on the very next page, where the author gives specimens of the Lord's Prayer in Old English and Middle English, the first is called "Anglo-Saxon" and the second "Old English."

About two pages are given to the subject of "Theories Concerning the Origin of Language" and "Theories Concerning the Beginnings of Speech." These theories are merely stated, not enough being said to enable the student to form any intelligent idea as to which of the theories is the most reasonable; yet in the questions for review (p. 34) the pupil is asked not only to state what these theories are, but also to tell which he adopts, and why. The subject of the theories concerning the origin of language and the beginnings of speech is of little practical importance and lies far above the capacity of most High-School pupils. It belongs rather in a special course for advanced students in a college or a university. To introduce such theories into an elementary course for young pupils, and, still more, to expect these to be able intelligently to adopt or reject one or another of them, is, to say the least, not a sign of much pedagogical wisdom. Young students cannot have or obtain knowledge enough on so difficult and abstract a subject to be able to say, with deliberation, that they accept or reject one or another theory with regard to it, and it is foolish to put such questions to any class of students except those of mature age.

Equally out of place in an elementary course are scraps of comparative philology picked from various sources and tacked together with little or no connection. Nearly a page, for example, is given to show the peculiarities of Semitic inflection, though there is hardly any-

thing to illustrate Indo-European inflection. A paragraph on the latter, showing that the various languages of the Indo-European family are all essentially alike in their inflectional system, would have been both instructive and interesting.

In the classification of the Indo-European languages there are several mistakes and omissions. Old Slavonic and Bulgarian are given as different languages, whereas the one is derived from the other; and Servian, Moravian, Slovakian, and other languages belonging to the Slavonic branch, are omitted. Old Prussian, an extinct language, is mentioned, but not Lithuanian and Lettish, which are still spoken. Scandinavian is put in between High Germanic and Low Germanic, whereas these two ought to be mentioned together, and Old Saxon, Frisian, Middle English, Modern English, Flemish, and other languages of the group, are omitted. Among the Celtic languages, Erse is not mentioned; but a few pages farther on, where forms of the word *father* in the various Indo-European languages are given, the Erse form occurs, though there is no explanation of the meaning of "Erse." In the same place (p. 10) *vatar* and *fader* are given as the Gothic and Dutch forms of this word; they should be respectively *fadar* and *vader*.

"In the Middle Ages the Arabs . . . . gradually brought under their dominion . . . . the countries of Southern Europe, forming the most powerful Semitic kingdom that has ever existed."

This would mean that the Arabs conquered not only Spain but also Italy and the Balkan Peninsula, to say nothing of other "countries in Southern Europe;" whereas the truth is that the Arabs gained permanent possession only of Spain. The Balkan Peninsula was not brought under Mohammedan rule till near the end of the Middle Ages, and then not under the rule of Semites but of Turks. Furthermore, the empire founded by the followers of Mohammed was never called a kingdom, and it soon split up into several parts, Spain being the first to separate from the unwieldy body.

On page 11 the statement is made that the attention of the Romans was first called to



Britain "about fifty-five years before Christ, when Julius Caesar was conquering the Celtic tribes in Spain and Gaul." Caesar had not for many years been in Spain at this time, but had been exclusively occupied with the conquest of Gaul. Then follows a passage on the early Britons, which is much too long, as the book is not a history of the peoples that have lived in England, but an elementary textbook on language, composition, rhetoric, and literature. In such a book an account of how the stones were placed in the ancient Druidic monuments at Carnac and Stonehenge is entirely out of place.

On page 13 is found the remark that "not more than a dozen Latin words were left by the Romans," and a few lines farther on (p.14) occurs the conflicting statement that "not more than one hundred Latin words have been added to the language by the five centuries of Roman rule."

On page 18 after giving the Lord's Prayer in Old English and in the version of Wyclif, the author adds that "it is interesting to notice how the Saxon tongue gradually changed in form, and how our modern English has improved upon the style of the first English translation of the Bible." One would like to have the author point out wherein "our modern English has improved upon the style of the first English translation of the Bible," a task which might prove somewhat difficult. Surely High-School pupils who have no knowledge of Old English cannot decide which of the two versions is superior in style.

Among the gods worshiped by the Teutonic invaders of Britain is mentioned Seterne, "of whom little is known except the name." Seterne is the Old-English form of Saturnus, after whom Saturday is named. He was not one of the Teutonic gods, and was not worshiped by the Teutons.

On page 21 the author says the Scandinavians who invaded England "lived in the southern part of Denmark, in part of Norway and Sweden, and in the very countries from which the English had come." It would be interesting to know what people lived in the northern part of Denmark, whether these were not Scandinavians also. The sentence illustrates the carelessness and indefiniteness pervading

the whole chapter. Farther down the same page the author says, "The Danes, it must be remembered, belonged to the same Teutonic race with the Saxons." From this the beginner has the right to infer that there were several Teutonic races, and that the Danes and the Saxons together belonged to one of these.

The leaders of the Scandinavian pirates who ravaged the coasts of England, France, and other countries, were not called Vikings, as we are told on page 22. This name was applied to all who engaged in such expeditions. The leaders were called Sea-kings.

"When the Normans had lived in France about one hundred years . . . . . their speech was more refined" than that of the English. This is an old assumption for which there is probably no ground. English had been cultivated as a literary language for about four centuries before the Norman Conquest, probably still longer; its grammar was rich in inflections and stable; it had developed a simple, clear, and vigorous prose style, hardly surpassed since, and a poetic form of no mean excellence; and it possessed a respectable literature both in prose and verse, which is still worth studying. With the possible exception of Icelandic (Old Norse), English was then the most cultivated vernacular language in Western Europe. The Romance languages, which are all derived from some variety of the Vulgar Latin (the *Lingua Romana Rustica*), had hardly assumed a stable form as yet, and literature was only just beginning in France, hardly anything worthy of the name having been composed in it before the middle of the eleventh century. The statement that Norman-French was superior to and more refined than English as spoken and written at the time of the Conquest, is an old one which will continue in one form or another to disfigure text-books on English until it becomes more common to learn something at first hand of the English language and literature before the Norman Conquest. It may then dawn upon the minds of some who now think otherwise, that the Old English (or Anglo-Saxon) was a rich and cultivated language, and that the effect upon it of the Norman Conquest was to impoverish it, and not, as is

commonly believed, to enrich it. That some centuries later, after it had been degraded and impoverished, and its grammar had become corrupt, it borrowed largely from the Norman-French and other sources to make up for what it had lost, is quite another matter.

"The greatest effect of the Norman Conquest upon the language was that it introduced the habit of borrowing words from other languages" (p. 26). This habit was already in vogue before the Conquest, a large number of words having been borrowed from Greek and Latin. The effect of the Norman Conquest upon the English Language was that the latter ceased to be a language of the ruling class, those who spoke it being deprived of nearly all the influential positions both in Church and State; that it was less cultivated as a literary language; and that, being thereby deprived of the conservative influence of literature, it became subject as never before to the processes of growth and decay, so that in one century after the Conquest it changed more than it had done in the four centuries preceding. The grammar was thrown into hopeless confusion, most of the old inflections being gradually lost, and hundreds of words were dropped and replaced by French words. Finally, after the loss of most of their French possessions, the Normans and the English began to amalgamate; the Normans learned to speak the language they had before despised; and in the fourteenth century, when so great an author as Chaucer chose to write in it rather than in French, the English language again attained the position it had lost at the time of the Conquest. But it was now a very different language; the rich inflections of the Old English period had almost entirely disappeared, and the vocabulary was nearly half French.

The criticism was made that the book is faulty in logic. An example or two will suffice. "Julius Caesar did not succeed in conquering the warlike Britons, although for nearly five centuries after his invasion the Romans regarded Britannia as one of their provinces" (p. 12). If, instead of the second, the first of these clauses began with "although," the sentence would have some meaning; but even then it would state only a half-

truth. The Romans not only regarded Britain as one of their provinces, but they actually conquered it, the conquest being begun in the reign of Claudius and finished in the reign of Domitian.

"As the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes mingled more and more, great changes became apparent in their form of speech, and in time the dialect of the West Saxons became the language of literature and of law. This is what is known as *Old English*. Thus it happens that the language of the Teutonic invaders is called sometimes *the Anglo-Saxon*, sometimes *the Saxon*, and sometimes *the English*" (p. 17).

The first sentence of this passage is meaningless. West Saxon became the literary language because the West Saxons became politically the dominant tribe in England, not because of changes, that became apparent in consequence of the mingling of the various tribes. In the last sentence "thus" has nothing to refer to. We are not told how or why "the language of the Teutonic invaders is called sometimes *the Anglo-Saxon*, sometimes *the Saxon*, and sometimes *the English*."

On page 29 occurs the surprising statement that "the English-speaking people are familiar with most of the other languages spoken in the world." The truth is that the English-speaking people, like other peoples, are familiar with no language but their own, and that most of them do not even know that very well. Perhaps this goes without saying; but in books for the young, one looks for more guarded statements.

Upon the whole, the first chapter of Lockwood's *Lessons in English* is as ill-proportioned and careless in style as anything I have ever met with in a text-book. Only a few of the many mistakes have been noticed, and yet it is time to bring these remarks to a close. Before doing so, however, I must substantiate my other charge, that the book also suffers from grammatical mistakes. Two such are found on page 71, in the questions, "What are [*sic*] represented by the birds and butterflies?" and "What are meant by the pebbles?"

ALBERT E. EGGE.

State University of Iowa.



## RECENT FRENCH TEXTS.

*Fleurs de France.* Quinze Contes choisis et annotés par C. FONTAINE, B. L., L. D., director of French Instruction in the High Schools of Washington, D. C. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1895, pp. 154.

*Les Historiens français du xix<sup>e</sup> siècle.* With explanatory, grammatical, historical and biographical notes by C. FONTAINE. New York: William R. Jenkins, 1894. 12mo, pp. 384.

*Jules Verne: Le Tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours.* Abbreviated edition with English notes by A. H. EDGREN, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Nebraska. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1894. Boards, 8vo, pp. 178.

THE 'conte' seems to have come to stay. I think it is well that it has. Experience suggests to me that the pithy, short story is the most satisfactory form of French literature to put before a college student in the earlier stages of his study. I referred, a year ago, in a review of a 'recueil' of 'contes' edited by M. Bercy, to the supremacy of the French in this kind of writing, and to the increasing demand for it in this country as material for class-room instruction. The appearance now of a new collection of recent French stories is justified by this demand.

*Fleurs de France* is the third 'recueil' that Professor Fontaine has given us. His two volumes of *Historiettes modernes*, of which the first appeared in 1888, are well known and have done excellent service. The present volume is due to the editor's wish to offer teachers of French a "nouveau recueil de contes qui représentent dans ce qu'il a de plus vivant l'esprit des écrivains modernes."

The fifteen stories comprising this collection have a decidedly modern or living tone and spirit about them. One or two of them might be termed 'fin de siècle.' This is true of the last and longest (pp. 25.) piece of the book, *Par le rapide* by Halévy, which racily develops a courtship and proffer of marriage during a trip from Paris to Marseille on the limited express. While all the stories of the collection are most readable and interesting for one who can fully appreciate the more

delicate tones of French literature, two or three of them (as *Le Cheval bleu* and *Solange-au-loup*) are rather naïve in treatment, where more vigor might be better suited to the average class-room. One of them (*Une Suite* by René Maizeroy) is quite melodramatic with interlarded English words à la Georges Ohnet. But as a whole they form a very attractive group, set off by much finely chiseled work. *Mademoiselle Sidonie*, by Paul Vigné d'Octon, is a charming sketch, with delicious bits of description. Among the better known writers who have been drawn upon are: Coppée (two selections), Halévy, Theuriet and Ernest Daudet.

The notes to the stories are fittingly brief, covering only difficult expressions and historical allusions. As in the second volume of the editor's *Historiettes*, the selections are preceded by short biographical notices when that has been possible. A table of contents might have facilitated the use of the book. Half a dozen typographical slips have been noted; they occur at: p. 20, l. 1; p. 31, l. 8; p. 36, l. 1; p. 69, l. 10; p. 97, l. 11; p. 128, l. 4. *Fleurs de France* is a very neat little volume and justifies its title. It deserves the same generous recognition that has been accorded the editor's previous collections.

*Les Historiens français* is the third volume of a series, begun in 1889, upon the French writers of this century, the first volume taking up the poets, the second (published in 1892) being devoted to the 'prosateurs.' In presenting the present collection, the editor has had in mind the study of the history of a country as an important adjunct to the study of its language:

"On a pensé que l'enseignement de la langue elle-même n'est pas le seul devoir qui s'impose au professeur. Il doit encore s'appliquer à développer l'ensemble des connaissances de ses élèves: or il n'en est point de plus importante que celle de l'histoire du pays dont ils étudient la grammaire et la littérature."

The study of the entire history of France being a task too long and too arduous, the editor has confined himself to the last two hundred and fifty years, beginning with the reign of Louis XIV. He wishes to present a volume of judiciously grouped extracts, which may stimulate American students to a more



thorough study of French history, as well as inspire in them 'respect and love' for France herself.

Professor Fontaine has made eighty-eight excerpts, most of them short, from eleven prominent historical writers of the nineteenth century. He has cleverly arranged his material, dividing it chronologically into fifteen periods. The extracts are skillfully bound together by historical comments in French, written by the editor himself. Each new narrative is thus led up to, there are substantially no breaks, and the whole forms a fairly good compendium of the history of France from the year 1643, to the present time. The editor has also added, from his own pen, a short chapter on the history of the last twenty years, closing with the election of President Casimir Périer. A concluding page refers to the present industrial and colonial interests of France.

A text-book like this of Professor Fontaine may be judged from two standpoints: (1) as material for the study of French literature, (2) as material for the study of French history. If our main object is to study the writings of the French historians as pieces of literature, then it seems to me that the extracts of *les Historiens français* are decidedly too short and scrappy. The chronological arrangement scatters the selections of the individual historians to all parts of the book. For a satisfactory study of such an author in the classroom, I should myself much prefer complete chapters or subjects, which would allow a fuller consideration of the writer's style and method. Aside from the critical study of literature, however, the subject matter of the volume constitutes a very interesting survey of French history, and the editor deserves much credit for his skillful manipulation of it. The notes, largely historical, are at the foot of the page, as are also the biographical notices of authors; the latter are brief and pointed.

Among the numerous texts for elementary work that have appeared during the past winter, *le Tour du monde* is worthy of special note. It is bright, interesting and not difficult. It has been judiciously condensed, without injury to the story, and brought within the limits of a few weeks study for first-year classes. A possible objection may be made

to the frequent recurrence in the story of numerous English words, but many of these are unavoidable borrowings, and the editor has carefully grouped most of them at the end of the book, indicating their common pronunciation in French. The notes have been made for comparative beginners, and cover just the needful points. A brief biographical notice characterizes pointedly the writer and his work, while a map outlines the itinerary of the hero.

Such an edition of this popular story is a welcome addition to the texts available for early reading, and can not fail to meet with favor. The number of misprints which occur is unfortunately larger than has been the rule in the volumes of the 'Modern Language Series' to which the book belongs. Mistakes in the text may be found on: p. 21, l. 19; p. 28, l. 12, l. 25; p. 29, l. 17; p. 30, l. 6 (the date); p. 39, l. 23, l. 32. p. 81, l. 20; p. 92, l. 7, l. 12; p. 95, l. 32. Also on the cover, *s* in the *Quatre-vingts* of the title is lacking. The boards are an improvement upon the previous paper covers of the series.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

#### SCANDINAVIAN GRAMMAR.

*A Danish and Dano-Norwegian Grammar.*

By P. GROTH, A. M. vi, 143 pp. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1894.

*A Short Scandinavian Grammar.* Oldnordisk Formlære i Grundrids. Being Outlines of Old Icelandic Accidence in Modern Danish. Edited by DR. KARL LENTZNER. 32 pp. Oxford: 1895.

THERE are several Danish grammars and at least one Dano-Norwegian one, for English students, but the work under notice is, as far as is known to me, the first systematic presentation in one volume of the differences between these two forms of Scandinavian speech. The plan of considering separately the sounds of the two languages, as one is almost tempted to call them, is heartily to be recommended. The phonetic differences between Danish proper and its Norwegian modification are, in fact, so radical as absolutely to necessitate such a separation. And in this connec-

tion the admirable presentation of the real nature of the literary language of Norway should receive special notice. With characteristic national pride many Norwegians that ought to know better call their language Norwegian. Our author sums up his discussion of the question with the clear and correct, but from the Norwegian standpoint, unpatriotic statement that

"we have at the present time two kinds of Danish language, the pure Danish used in Denmark and by Danish authors, and the Dano-Norwegian used in Norway by most of the educated classes, especially in the cities, and by most of the Norwegian authors."

It may be assumed that the reproduction of the Norwegian sounds is correct, since it is based on the actual observation and practice of the author. The same, unfortunately, cannot be said of Mr. Groth's treatment of the Danish sounds, which, if my own observations be correct, shows numerous faults. This unequal treatment is not at all strange, for the very similarity of Danish and Dano-Norwegian undoubtedly proved a drawback rather than a help to the author. Another source of mistakes is probably to be found in one of the authorities to which acknowledgment is made in the preface, Poëstion's *Dänische Sprache*, which, though possessing many valuable features, must be used with caution.

Among the incorrect pronunciations of the Danish vowels may be noted the following:—

"*A* has a sound very near that of English *a* in father." This is the case in two of the examples given but not in *Gade* and *Abe*, where and always before *b*, *d*, *g*, *v* it has the sound of *a* in *fat* prolonged and not, as is stated, 'in the vulgar Copenhagen pronunciation alone.' I have yet to meet the Dane, educated or uneducated, who fails to make a distinction of quality between long and short *a*. The examples of *æ* (long)=represented by *e* should not include *bedre*, *regjere*, *tjene*, *sjerde* and several others. The *i* in *fisk*, *Pligt*, etc., does not represent the sound *é* in *été*, but a sound intermediate between *é* and *i*, while *Kunst* and *Kuffert* may also be spelt with *o*, the pronunciation is in either case *u* and not as is stated, *o*.

Under the consonants the following points were noted: the initial of *Viol* and *Violin* is

no longer pronounced as *f*, and *Fernis* is, so far as is known to me, never written *Vernis*. It is not so given, at least, by A. Larsen. Neither is *Stiffader* a common form for *Stedfader*. The statement that 'colloquially *v* is often dropped after *l*' is hardly strong enough, as the *v* is practically never heard in such words as *tolv*, *halv*, etc. *D* is never sounded, except by poetical license, in *læsende*, *Tidende*, *Ælde*, *Kunde* and *Vælde*.

It has been stated that the Danish sounds must offer special difficulty to a Norwegian. To all students, however, the pronunciation of this Scandinavian language must be more or less of a horror. As compared with Dano-Norwegian or with Swedish, Danish sounds almost slovenly, especially when spoken by Copenhageners. My purpose in dwelling upon certain incorrect representations of Danish sounds must not be regarded as a reflection on the general value of this grammar, but rather as an illustration of the almost total depravity of spoken Danish. Dr. Groth is to be congratulated not only for having produced the first real Danish grammar in English, but also for having given a valuable popular treatment of the subject. The practical purpose of the book has been constantly kept in view and the mark of the experienced teacher is seen on every page.

Dr. Lentzner's *Outlines* would have been made much more generally useful had either English or German been adopted for the discussion of the Icelandic forms. While perhaps all Scandinavian scholars include modern Danish in their studies, many make a beginning with the older language. Furthermore, there already exists an admirable treatment of Old Norse accidence in Danish, compiled by Prof. Wimmer, which, details apart, differs from the present work only in being less condensed. It is to be hoped that if a second edition be called for, it may appear in the language of the students for whom its place of publication shows that it is intended.

The unavoidably close resemblance between these *Outlines* and Prof. Wimmer's *Formlære* naturally suggests a comparison between the two treatments. The first difference that strikes one is to the advantage of the former, in that a distinction is made between the sym-



bol for the open and close *e* that does not appear in the fourth edition of the *Formlære* the latest known to me. A valuable feature of Prof. Wimmer's work, a list of the Danish grammatical terms with the Latin Equivalents is, on the other hand, omitted. This is particularly unfortunate in a grammar intended for English readers, for whom such a word as *Medlydsammensmæltning* is, to say the least, an awkward substitute for *assimilation*. Indeed, it would be better still to omit the Danish terms altogether. Another omission, evidently a result of the severe condensation employed by the author, is the failure to give examples of the various phonetic changes discussed. The gain in space seems frequently to be made at the expense of clearness. The statement § 10, that 'final *g* is often lost in the strong preterits' might be improved by substituting 'as a rule' for 'often.' The treatment of nouns according to their stems is a marked improvement on Prof. Wimmer's classification by inflectional endings. In spite of its Danish form, this summing up of Old-Norse forms ought to prove of value for purposes of ready reference.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

#### FRENCH LANGUAGE.

*The Academic French Course*, in accordance with the latest Grammatical Rules adopted by the French Academy. By ANTOINE MUZZARELLI, Professor of Modern Languages and Literature. *First Year* (pp. 233 and pp. 66 vocabulary and index). American Book Co, Cincinnati.

*Lectures faciles pour l'Etude du Français*. Avec notes grammaticales et explicatives. By PAUL BERCY, B.L., L.D., Director of P. Bercy's School of Languages, N. Y. (Pp. 207, and pp. 48 notes and tables.) New York: W. R. Jenkins.

THE author does not believe in the "much vaunted Natural method." He adheres to the "Standard method," endeavoring at the same time to make his book "practical." We find rules on pronunciation, on the parts of speech, with plenty, a great plenty, of simple exer-

cises, lessons for recapitulation for written and oral use, and (pp. 166-181) a dozen short and simple pieces in French for translation and "general recapitulation," mainly by means of changes in gender, number, or person, indicated by the author. An appendix of fifty pages on "Syntax" contains very little of syntax, twenty-two pages being filled with paradigms of verbs and most of the remaining space with tables, lists, and rules for the formation of plural and feminine, etc. "The subjunctive mood, the irregular verbs and their derivatives, together with various other instruments of torture to a beginner, have been left over for the second year." (!) No subjunctive form occurs in the volume, except in the paradigms. Only very few errors have been noticed (p. 105, Combien de cerises as-tu mangé?). Teachers who share the author's pedagogical views will have no fault to find with his book.

The twenty-two short modern tales contained in M. Bercy's collection are entertaining and, in the main, well chosen. The author's plan, to teach French syntax in close connection with the text, by means of observation and induction, will commend itself to most teachers, and the 'notes grammaticales,' following each story, will prove an aid to this end, without hindering the teacher from modifying the course suggested, if he prefers. The book has no vocabulary, but a number of idioms and phrases are translated in notes at the end of the volume. This collection of stories may be used to good advantage also by teachers who do not approve of the author's method of teaching as set forth in his other publications.

A. LODEMAN.

*Ypsilanti, Mich.*

#### FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Michel Strogoff*, par JULES VERNE, abridged and edited with notes by EDWIN SEELYE LEWIS, Ph. D., Princeton University. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1894. vii+222 pp., 12mo.<sup>1</sup> 3d. ed.

<sup>1</sup> In this third edition the editor has corrected a few (not all) typographical errors, and has added a short table of verbal endings (page 223). It would, perhaps, have been



DR. LEWIS thinks that an American student should begin reading French as soon as the regular verbs have been reached, and before attempting the irregular verbs; with this idea in view he edits the text noted above. Its distinguishing features are: 1. That all the irregular verbs in the text are referred by number to a list in the back of the book; 2. A classified list is given of subjunctives to which the notes constantly refer.

As the editor states in his preface, the list of irregular verbs and the treatment of the subjunctive are taken almost entirely from Whitney's *Grammar*; and, apparently, the only addition made to Whitney's list of irregular verbs is *dépendre*.<sup>3</sup>

"The unessential and least interesting parts [of the text], usually descriptive of people and scenery, have been cut out, and brief summaries in English made of them."

The result is a most interesting and concise tale in which my last year's Freshman class took keen interest.

It is a pity that Dr. Lewis did not add a map of the scene of action, as Prof. Edgren does in his *Le Tour du monde en Quatre-vingts Jours* (1894); for there are many geographical points for which students and instructor vainly look in the notes. The book is neatly printed in the main, although not a few typographical errors have escaped attention; thus, in the text:

Page.	Line.		
3,	26,	for <i>pietine</i>	read <i>piétine</i> .
9,	12,	" <i>intérêt</i>	" <i>intérêt</i> .
59,	22,	" <i>de</i>	" <i>des</i> .
63,	6,	" <i>le</i>	" <i>les</i> .
63,	14,	" <i>complètement</i>	" <i>complètement</i> .
93,	19,	" <i>mère</i>	" <i>mère</i> .
132,	16,	" <i>côte</i>	" <i>côté</i> .
139,	13,	" <i>complètement</i>	" <i>complètement</i> .
167,	8,	" <i>nuis</i>	" <i>nuits</i> .
171,	11,	" <i>le</i>	" <i>ne</i>

In the notes:

well to give the exceptions (*sommes, dites, faites*, etc.) to the forms *-ons* and *-es* given in the table; or at least to mention that there are exceptions to the forms given.

<sup>2</sup> A most excellent plan.

<sup>3</sup> The statement is made in the preface that a number of additions is given to Whitney's list.

Page. Line.

18,	2, for 2	read 3.
28,	19, " 19	" 10. (?)
48,	25, " <i>eut</i>	" <i>eût</i> .
62,	24, " 62	" 63.
71,	11, " <i>quelquechose</i>	" <i>quelque chose</i> .
103,	6, " <i>quelquechose</i>	" <i>quelque chose</i> . <sup>4</sup>

The notes to the first part of the text are very full, and are later confined mostly to references to the list of subjunctives. Occasionally the expected note is lacking: page 6, "guidé par un instinct de *Delaware*"; page 15, "podaroshna"; pages 23 and 24, "tarentass" and "têlêgue" are not distinguished; page 25, "iemschik"; page 46, "kreml"; page 86, "Béranger"; page 128, "image de la Panaghia."

Sometimes the editor's statements seem rather vague: in the notes to page 2, lines 9 and 16, the student is told that *ce* is used in preference to *il* in "such expressions as these," and the note to page 3, line 32, refers him back to this explanation. Similarly, page 67, line 22, the editor, in a note to "pour qui," remarks: "this is one of the rare cases, in French, where the antecedent of the relative may be omitted"; but he does not explain just what constitutes the present case. Nor is it sufficient, in commenting on "ainsi que l'avait dit" (p. 6, l. 25), to assert that "*le*, the neuter pronoun, should seldom be translated in (?) English." The student does not know what "neuter pronoun" means, and looks in vain for a reference to the grammar. (Cf. p. 19, l. 15, note). The note to page 13, line 15: "était-il is here neuter, viz. 'was it'" (I quote the note entire), is not likely to make the point clear. How can *était-il* be neuter?

The translation of some passages would seem rather too free for the best interests of the elementary student; thus, "cheval de fond" (page 55, line 11) is translated: "of good qualities"; page 83, line 14, "cela ne faisait

<sup>4</sup> The following errors occur in the first edition (1893) and are corrected in the third:

Page 6, line	8, for <i>guide</i>	read <i>guidé</i> .
" 12, "	28, " <i>liséré</i>	" <i>liséré</i> .
" 57, "	3, " <i>main</i>	" <i>main</i> s.
" 91, "	11 and 17, " <i>côte</i>	" <i>côté</i> .

In the notes:

Page 13, line 30, for <i>lui même</i>	read <i>lui-même</i>
" 36, " 1, " <i>fut</i>	" <i>fût</i> .

pas l'affaire du correspondant': "this was not what the correspondent intended to allow"; page 117, line 32, 'tant bien que mal': "as far as it could"; page 167, line 9, 'à beau-coup près': "by a good deal"; page 170, line 8, 'en dehors de lui et par': "as owing not to him but to"; and page 172, line 27, 'avoir bon marché de': "to have soon done with." The translation is right, of course; is right in every case; but a text for beginners is not, I think, the place for free translation. It is not so much the idea as the grammatical construction, the syntax, the form, that is of paramount importance for beginners; and to my mind free translation (in notes or glossary) is the curse of modern elementary text-books.

But to return to the text.—In the note to page 3, line 8, the editor translates *du* in 'tête carrée du haut,' as "as to"; it would perhaps have been well to add that *de* here, is, as usual, the English "of"; as, in "strong of limb" and the like. In the note to line 11 of the same page (3), 'venait à' is explained, and 'venir de' is treated in the notes to pages 7 and 17, lines 22 and 12 respectively; but *venir* without following preposition is not mentioned. One note should have explained the three uses.

I trust that more intelligent students than those whom I have had to teach, will not argue from the translation "nothing less than" given in 'Le gros gibier n'était rien de moins que l'ours sibérien,' that, if the game were nothing, less than it was bear, it could not have been bear—for bear it undoubtedly was (p. 5. l. 12). The note should have added that the *de* is here partitive. Page 5, line 23, note; 'manquer de' does not always mean "to fail to"; the statement should be restricted. And page 14, line 31: Is the inversion in 'Aussi . . . les portières s'ouvrirent-elles, et les voyageurs, effarés, n'eurent-ils qu'une pensée,' due, as the editor states, to vivid narration, or merely to the fact that *aussi* usually requires such inversion when it begins a sentence? Again, the translation "whose only profile," "whose single profile" is scarcely satisfactory for 'dont le seul profil' (p. 17, l. 10, note); nor is there necessarily any difference in the meaning of the expression given and that of 'dont le profil

seul,' which Dr. Lewis contrasts with it.

The note to p. 27, line 20, calls attention to the omission of *pas* after *pouvoir*. Why not add *savoir*, *cesser* and *oser*? Is it not only by taking advantage of such "openings" that syntax can be successfully taught? If it be true, as we are told in the note to page 49, line 22, that "*tout* before a feminine adjective or noun, has the feminine form *toute* only when the following adjective or noun begins with a consonant," how does the editor account for such constructions as 'toute autre chose' (Cf. Littré)?

Finally, few, I think, will agree with the editor that 'il nous va falloir nous séparer' (p. 116, l. 20, note) "would be grammatical but inelegant." Is it not ungrammatical as well as inelegant?

Possibly the biographical note is the least essential part of an elementary text-book; Dr. Lewis has apparently so considered it in the book before us. It seems surprising that he should have found "the material already in existence for Jules Verne's life most meagre and contradictory"; at least it would seem strange until we find his sources. Neither Johnson's *New Universal Cyclopædia* nor the *American Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica* can be considered final sources for the biography of contemporary French writers, and a cursory glance at the articles on Jules Verne (or the fact that he is not mentioned) in Lorenz,<sup>5</sup> Larousse,<sup>6</sup> Weller,<sup>7</sup> Cushing,<sup>8</sup> Qué-rard,<sup>9</sup> Sommervogel<sup>10</sup> and Vapereau<sup>11</sup>—or any one of them—would have doubtless induced the editor to discard as highly improbable the statement made in *The Diatribe* and

<sup>5</sup> *Catalogue général de la librairie française*, t. iv, 1871, s. v.

<sup>6</sup> *Dict. du XIXe siècle*, t. xv, 1876, s. v.

<sup>7</sup> Weller, Emil; *Lexicon Pseudonymorum*, 2nd ed., 1886. Not mentioned.

<sup>8</sup> *Anonyms*, 1889. Not mentioned.

<sup>9</sup> *Les supercheries littéraires dévoilées*, 3e éd., t. iii, 1870. Not mentioned.

<sup>10</sup> *Dict. des ouvr. anonymes et pseud.*, 1884. Not mentioned.

<sup>11</sup> *Dict. univ. des contemp.*, 5e éd., Paris, 1880.

<sup>12</sup> Vol. xiv, p. 289; the article is "a quotation from the *London Literary World*."



quoted by him, that the novelist is a native of Warsaw, Olchewitz by name, and that "Verne" is but a translation of the "initial syllable of his family patronymic";<sup>13</sup> and such reading would also have convinced him<sup>14</sup> that the author of the work edited was born at Nantes, February 8, 1828, a Frenchman of France, and not in 1814 as the American Supplement of the *Britannica* (I believe alone) supposes.

[I received the following letter from Jules Verne after the review, given above, had been written :

Amiens, le 17 Avril, 1895.

Cher Monsieur,

Je me hâte de répondre à votre aimable lettre que je viens de recevoir à l'instant. Elle a couru à Nantes, puis à Paris, et elle est arrivée à Amiens, ma ville d'adoption, où je demeure depuis 25 ans. La fable ou légende que vous me citez, j'ai déjà eu l'occasion de la démentir. Non, je ne suis point Polonais. Je suis Français, né à Nantes, 8 février 1828, de parents français, mon père étant originaire des environs de Paris (Provins, Brie) et ma mère de la Basse-Bretagne (Morlaix). C'est être déjà vieux que d'être né en 1828, et je proteste absolument contre la date de 1814. Il me faudrait encore un certain nombre d'années pour achever l'oeuvre des Voyages Extraordinaires! Y arriverais-je à les avoir? . . . qui sait, si ce n'est la Providence!

Veuillez me compter parmi vos amis, cher monsieur, moi qui compte bien des amis, je crois, dans les Etats-Unis d'Amérique.

JULES VERNE.]

W. STUART SYMINGTON, JR.

*Leland Stanford Jr. University.*

I MUST thank Mr. Symington for the foregoing review, and am only sorry it did not appear sooner, so that use might have been made of it in the preparation of my third edition of *Michel Strogoff*. There are one or two suggestions, however, conveyed by this review, which, in justice to myself, should be corrected.

In such words as *complètement*, I retain

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Lewis does not notice that *Verne* is not "beech" but "alder." See preface.

<sup>14</sup> The editor gives his readers the choice of the two dates (1814 and 1828), but adds in the foot-note: "So far as I know at present, this [1828] is the correct statement." It may be of interest to know that M. Jules Troubat, librarian at the *Bibliothèque nationale*, Paris, kindly confirmed my opinions as expressed above.

Verne's spelling, for he often uses an acute accent over the *e* immediately preceding a mute *e*; for the same reason do I retain the hyphen between *très* and a following adjective. I thought every American student would understand the reference to a "Delaware"; *podaroshna* is explained, I think, in the course of the text, and I give translations for *tarentass*, *télégue*, *ienschik* and *kremt*. Such expressions would be as strange to a French boy as they are to our young students, and I think it is really a mistake to weary the latter with too frequent notes, which would then, I fear, be read only by the instructor. As for the note on *pour qui*, it should have been quoted in full (the reference is to p. 6, l. 22); this is the final statement: "the full expression would be *pour celui qui*, the shorter *pour qui* being more indefinite."<sup>1</sup> I rather like the term "neuter pronoun," which I am by no means the first to use, but it is true that *était-il* cannot be neuter, any more than "was it" in English; this reading will be changed in the next edition.

Now we come to the use of free translation with American students. If it be true that "free translation is the curse of modern elementary text-books," I think it no less true that "literal translation is the bane of modern language teaching in all grades," and I have in mind more than one edition of French texts. In other words, the two extremes are injurious. I often give the literal translation of French expressions, generally accompanied with a rendering into idiomatic English. Sometimes I do not give this literal paraphrasing, and for obvious reasons, especially when the words are common. For example, how do the following sentences sound in English: "Horse of depth," "this did not make the affair of the correspondent," "as well as badly," "to a good deal near," "outside of him and by," "have cheap of?" No, there are times when a literal translation is nothing short of absurd, though the instructor must be most careful not to allow free translation to be synonymous with careless translation.

<sup>1</sup> And so with my rendering of *manquer de* on p. 5, l. 23; I translate it here so as to help the student in this particular passage. A glance at any French dictionary, under *manquer* would show the need of such assistance.



Careless translation is, most assuredly, the "curse" of modern language teaching, a curse which fortunately our American instructors are guarding against more and more.

I must confess that I do not fully appreciate the logical reasoning of Mr. Symington's students in the translation of *rien de moins que*, but this is probably not the first time a teacher has been mystified by a student's reasoning. As to Mr. Symington's remark about my note on *tout*, I need only say that I was referring to the adverbial use of *tout*, as illustrated in both the examples noted, of which the second is: *si, toute femme, tout enfant qu'elle était*. *Toute* is used before *autre* when it qualifies the following feminine noun; as, for example, *toute autre place qu'un trône eût été*, meaning *toute place autre qu'un trône*, etc.;<sup>2</sup> but when *tout* modifies *autre* itself, it remains unchanged, as in *vous méritez une tout autre fortune, donnez-moi une tout autre occupation*. Yet in my next edition I shall state distinctly that I am referring to the adverbial use of *tout*. In an elementary textbook, however, such niceties of spelling need not be considered, and especially as they are not mentioned in such a work as Whitney's large French Grammar (cf. § 116, *c*, where, it is true, the example *elles sont toutes malades* is unfortunate).

But I must pass on to statements which, if correct, would show that I am a most careless, nay, even ignorant editor. I refer to Mr. Symington's comments on my unpretentious biographical note. While reading whatever material I could find on Verne's life, I was rather amused at three statements contained in generally reliable works; my amusement was caused by the wide difference of opinion on the birth and life of an author so well-known as Jules Verne, who was born in the beginning of this century. So I quoted these three statements, remarking in a note that I considered correct the one found in Johnson's *New Universal Cyclopædia* (iv, p. 1137); namely, that Verne "was born at Nantes on the 8th February, 1828." And now I am supposed to find these sources "final." I mention

<sup>2</sup> This use of *toute* is the same as in the example *j'y resterai toute une année* (Edgren's *French Grammar*, § 292); that is, *toute* is here an adjective.

in a note which statement I believe to be correct, and, in spite of that, my reviewer seems to be under the impression that I think Verne to be the translation of a Polish name Olchewitz; he even represents me as not noticing that *verne* means "alder," and not "beech," when I am merely quoting from the *Dial* a statement taken from the *London Literary World*. If Verne is mentioned (or "not mentioned") only in the dictionaries and catalogues cited by Mr. Symington, I shall still maintain that "the material already in existence for Jules Verne's life is most meagre." The article which I said, in my preface, was sent me by Mr. S. S. McClure, has since then appeared in his *Magazine*, and is still the most interesting article which has come to light so far. I merely ask that Mr. Symington's review of my biographical note be compared with the note itself, and I believe that most editors will agree with me in thinking that such criticism is more careless, to say the least, than my note appears to the critic. Notice, for instance, the fourteenth and last note: I am supposed to "give my readers the choice of two dates," and then I am made to "add" that "this is the correct statement." What is the correct statement? The choice? This misrepresentation is unfortunate, especially when my note very distinctly referred to a statement which I am glad to see has since been confirmed by M. Jules Troubat.

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

Princeton University.

#### GERMAN LANGUAGE.

*Deutsche Studentensprache* von FRIEDRICH KLUGE, Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. B. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1895. 8vo, pp. x, 136.

IN this comprehensive little book, Kluge has given to students of the German language much new and valuable information about the etymology of numerous words which have long been in familiar use, but whose historical origin has thus far remained unknown to makers of dictionaries. Besides presenting the results of the laborious investigations necessary for a special work of this kind, he has brought to bear a rich fund of knowledge,

gained by years of experience as a teacher and student of academic life in Germany.

The necessarily extensive *Belesenheit* in the whole field of German literature, required in the writing of an etymological dictionary, has particularly fitted the author for the task, thus far to a large extent neglected, of giving us a thorough history of the part that student life has played in the formation of the literary language of modern Germany. And for the past three or four years he has used what time he could spare from his professorial duties in Jena and Freiburg, in collecting materials for the present work, a part of which he had already given to the German public in a lecture delivered in Jena in 1892, entitled, *Ueber deutsche Studentensprache*, and which was published in *Beilage* No. 297, of the *Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung* for 1892.

Though a large number of words considered by Kluge in his new book appear in several of the completer dictionaries of New High German; for example, in those of Grimm and Sanders, yet much of the material is entirely new, and many words which have long had a place in the literary language and whose etymology has ever been doubtful, are traced back to their origin in the student life of two hundred years ago; moreover, no one else has given such an exhaustive list of references for the use of those words to the literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some of the most important of these sources have been entirely overlooked even by such careful and scholarly lexicographers as the Brothers Grimm.

Kluge divides the subject-matter of his book into two parts. Part i (pp. 1-74) treats of the *Studentensprache*; part ii (pp. 75-136) is given up to a *Wörterbuch der Studentensprache*. The different sources or different phases of student life in which numerous *burschikose* words had their origin, are treated in so many different subdivisions under Part i, which are taken as points of departure for the many interesting discussions that fill the first half of the book. These headings are: *Studenten und Philister*; *Trunkenlitanei*; *Antike Elemente*; *Burschikose Zoologie*; *Biblische-theologische Nachklänge*; *Im Bann des Rotwelsch*; *Französische Einflüsse*; *Grammatische Eigenart*;

*Ursprung und Verbreitung*. In the preface the author tells briefly how he came to interest himself in this subject:

"Wenn ich im Verlauf meiner Arbeiten zur Entstehung unserer Schriftsprache und während der lexikalischen Sammlungen, die der 5. Auflage meines Etymologischen Wörterbuchs zu Grunde liegen, auf den Anteil der einzelnen Stände am Wachsen und Werden unserer Gemeinsprache geführt worden bin, so lud mich die Studentensprache noch aus andern Gründen zu einer zusammenhängenden Betrachtung ein. Die Geschichte der Universitätsstadt (i. e. Jena) in der ich diese Studien begonnen, legte mir oft genug den Gedanken an die Studentensprache nahe und schliesslich erweckte Moritz Heynes Deutung der Worte "burschikos" und "Hallore" in mir die Hoffnung, dass ein Versuch über Wesen und Geschichte der Studentensprache zu wissenschaftlichen Ergebnissen führen würde."

He feels however, that his book is not an exhaustive treatment of this comparatively new subject, and offers it to students of the German language "als Beitrag zur deutschen Sprachgeschichte und Lexikographie," having remarked (p. x.):

"Trotz so mancher Förderung habe ich nicht die ganze einschlägige Litteratur verwertet. Das Wortmaterial ist zumeist versteckt in entlegenen Quellen die auch auf reichen Bibliotheken fehlen. Meine Liste von unbenutzten Denkmälern, die Studentisches bieten müssen, ist nicht klein. Aber schon jetzt ist das Wortmaterial so reichhaltig, dass ich einen Versuch wagen durfte. Und um so eher ist ein solcher jetzt am Platz, als sich auf dem Gebiet der deutschen Lexikographie gewichtige Stimmen hören lassen, die mit Recht ein neues Programm von einem grossen Zukunftswörterbuch verlangen. Abergern und dankbar erkenne ich die mannigfachen Anregungen und Nachweise an, die in den grossen Wörterbüchern (Grimm und Sanders) grade für meine Zwecke enthalten sind—wenn auch immerhin verwundterbar bleibt, wie z. B. das Grimm'sche Wörterbuch die studentikose Schriftstellerei Laukhards hat völlig ausser Acht lassen können."

In the following remarks on the subject-matter of the text the author will, as far as possible, be permitted to speak for himself. Time and space will permit only the mentioning of a very few of the interesting word-histories in which the first part of Kluge's book abounds. Notice will also be given, by the



way, to what seems to the writer to be the most apparent faults of the work, like the omission from the text and vocabulary of certain words which are in common vogue among German students of to-day, and which are not explained in the better modern German dictionaries. In a treatise on the *Studentensprache* one expects to find explanations given of the more modern as well as of the earlier words of purely academic origin, and it is rather discouraging to have the author say in the beginning (p. x) that

"die hundert Jahre von Zachariäs Renomist 1744 an bis zu dem Studentikosen Idiotikon von 1841 sind es im wesentlichen, die unseren Wörterbuch das Material geliefert haben,"

when so many words have their origin in the student-life of the last fifty years. Nor are these words to be found in any of the well-known and generally accessible dictionaries of the German language. Some of the words which are to-day in common use in the student circles of Germany and which are doubtless "von burschikosem Ursprung," and which Kluge fails to notice because they are modern and because "eine Reihe von mehr oder weniger umfangreichen Wörterbüchern sie verzeichnen" will be mentioned further on.

"Unsere Burschensprache," says Kluge (p. 7):

"umfasst das ganze Studentenleben in seinen Formen und Äusserungen. Was den Einzelnen und die Verbindungen oder die Gesamtheit betrifft, hat einen studentikosen Ausdruck gefunden. Das ganze Zechwesen umgibt ein eigener Schatz. Die Welt um sich herum sieht der Student mit selbständigem Blick an und findet für sie Bezeichnungen, die durch die Prägnanz und Schärfe der Beobachtung, aus der sie hervorgegangen sind, mit der Schlagfertigkeit der unlitterarischen Volkssprache wetteifern können. Seine Schattierungen für moralische oder intellektuelle Fehler überraschen uns hier oft ebenso wie die sinnliche Kraft und natürliche Urwüchsigkeit, der kernige Humor und die kecke Dreistigkeit der Sprachhandhabung in anderen Fällen. Diese Frische und Ursprünglichkeit, dieses eigenartige Sprachleben verdient schon an und für sich ernstes Studium, verlangt es aber gebieterisch als Quelle, aus der unsere Schriftsprache viel des Guten und des Besten übernommen hat."

Of German Universities we have learnt that Halle, Giessen and before all Jena, have been most important in the formation of the "Burschikose" or "Kastensprache." We should naturally expect this when we consider the fact that these universities were, in all respects, the largest and most flourishing of the universities of Germany during the previous century. They were situated in or about the centre of Protestant Germany and were, so to speak, the hot-beds whence new ideas political and religious, found their way into all parts of the empire. We must, moreover, look for reforms of whatever kind in Germany during the past hundred years and more, to Protestantism rather than to Catholicism.

"Die Burschensprache (cf. p. 3) dieser drei Universitäten steht im Mittelpunkt unserer Betrachtungen, weil das Material über sie am reichsten fließt. Jena zumal hat in der Geschichte des Studententums immer eine dominierende Stellung über unsere übrigen Hochschulen gehabt: von dort aus wurde der studentische Ton immer wieder angegeben, dort blieb oft der überkommene Brauch älterer Geschlechter in Blüte, nachdem andere Universitäten wie Leipzig und Göttingen modischer Ausländerei zu huldigen angefangen hatten. Und inmitten jener rauf- und zechlustigen Generationen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts herrschte in Jena eine ausgebildete Kastensprache."

This *Kastensprache* was so distinctly "studentisch" at Giessen in the eighteenth century that it was absolutely incomprehensible to the uninitiated—"ein Deutsch, das ein Deutscher sowenig verstehe wie Arabisch" (p. 4). The sources of our knowledge of this *Studentensprache* up to the middle of the preceding century are very scant and limited in scope. Among the most important of these to which Kluge had access in the preparation of his book, were (cf. p. 5): J. G. Schoch's *Comoedia vom Studentenleben* which appeared in 1659 in "Makaronischem Latein;" the *Jus Potandi von Multibus* which passed through eight editions during the seventeenth century; Zachariäs's *Renomist* from about the middle of the eighteenth century; the *Hospitium* (1747); but,

"alles übertrifft an Fülle des Sprachmaterials die burschikose Schriftstellerei des Friedr. Chr. Laukhard die—vom grossen Wörterbuch



der Gebrüder Grimm zwar ganz übersehen—einen Einblick in die Burschensprache vom Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts gewährt, wie er vielseitiger und reichhaltiger nicht gedacht werden kann;”

then comes Fischer's *Burschiade* (1781), and Bahrdt's *Leben und Thaten des vieland hochwürdigen Pastor Rindvigius* (1790) a sort of prosaic *Jobstade*. Toward the close of the eighteenth century, *Studenten-Wörterbücher* begin to make their appearance, such as, Chr. W. Kindleben's *Studenten-Lexikon* (1781) of which *Salmasius und Prokax in den vergnügten Abendstunden* (Erfurt 1749) was a forerunner; and Augustin's *Idiotikon der Burschensprache* (1795).

Among the large number of words which are now in common use in Germany and whose histories as given by Kluge are especially interesting, mention may be made of *Fuchs*, *Philister*, *Backfisch*, *Salamander*, *Athen* (in *Saalathen*, *Elbathen*, etc.), *Musensohn*, *Bursche*, *bemoostes Haupt*, *Kameel*, *Schmollis*, *Fiduzit*, *fidel*, words beginning with the latin prefix *ex*, as *Exkneipe*, *Exbummel*, and also the absolute use of *ex* in expressions like 'Salamander *ex*,' 'Schönes Lied *ex*.'

In order that a general idea may be obtained of the author's method of treating the more interesting of these words it will be necessary to give his etymology of only one or two; for example, *Fuchs* and *Backfisch*.

"Der Ausdruck *Fuchs* (cf. p. 9) hat erst im Anfang des vorigen Jahrhunderts seine heutige Bedeutung erhalten."

Then further pp. 50-51:

"Die Geschichte des worts *Fuchs*, eines weithin bekannt gewordenen Burschenwortes, ist noch nicht ganz aufgeheilt. Es ist fast 200 Jahre lang im heutigen Sinne bezeugt und in unsern Wörterbüchern belegt . . . . Stoppe 1728 Gedichte i, 133, hat:

Was ist ein junger Fuchs? ein mensch der sauft und frisst  
Und von der Vaterstadt drei Jahr verwiesen ist.

Es war eigentlich *Schulfuchs*; denn Steinbach 1725 bucht dies als "juvenis qui ex schola in academiam defertur," öfters ist es als studentisch gleich "Gymnasiast" angegeben und weitverbreitet war es für einen gelehrten Pedanten. *Fuchs* scheint eins zu sein mit einem seltsamen *Foss*, das—bei Hans Sachs im 40. Fasnachtsspiel *Der Partekensack* v. 348, 369, 382 belegt—von Jakob Grimm DWB. iv, 1, 42 nicht erkannt ist. Der studentische Ur-

sprung dieses *Foss* ergibt sich aus einer Stelle bei Mathesius 1560 Von der Schule Elise C iii a: "sie müssen sich Schulpfaffen, Vosen und Pachanten achelten lassen." Und ausdrücklich in den Bereich der Universität verweist dieses Wort unser ältestes Fremdwörterbuch, Simon Roth's *Dictionarium* 1571. Roth sagt: 'Phos ein Spottwort der groben Ungelehrten, damit sie meinen die Gelehrten und sonst Studiosen zu verletzen.' Nun heisst der Fuchs auf Niederdeutsch *Voss* und so mag eine niederdeutsche Universität—etwa Rostock, vielleicht auch Wittenberg, das damals überwiegend platt sprach—in irgend einer Weise für die Geschichte des studentischen Fuchses oder Bachanten bedeutsam gewesen sein und Fuchs ergab sich als hochdeutsche Lantentsprechung für ein niederdeutsches *Voss* ganz von selbst."

The word *Backfisch* (applied to a girl from about fourteen to sixteen or seventeen years of age) is (cf. p. 19)

"aus der Burschensprache in unsern allgemeinen Sprachschatz übergegangen; es ist für das 17. Jahrhundert als studentisch bezeugt (*Facetiae Facietiarum* 1645, S. 255, 355) und noch die neuern studentikosen Wörterbücher buchen es so,"

and further (p. 55):

"*Fisch* ist bei dem burschikosen Lexikographen Vollmann 1846 studentisch für Mädchen." Und das seit längerer Zeit allgemein übliche *Backfisch* nehmen ältere burschikose Wörterbücher mit recht als studentisch auf: die frühesten Belege dafür in der Litteratur bestätigen burschikosen Ursprung mit voller Sicherheit."

Then on p. 71:

Und so ist das eigtl. studentische *Backfisch* wohl aus der Sprache der Fischer abzuleiten, die die kleineren zarten Fische zum Backen von den grösseren derben Fischen zum Kochen unterscheiden mochten."

Only a small proportion of the one thousand and more words of student origin in the vocabulary, which takes up the latter half of the book, could be discussed in the limited space of seventy-five pages, but in the discussion Kluge has generally chosen those of most importance from a literary historical point of view. He failed to mention a very ordinary meaning of *pauken* ("thresh," "fight"); that is, "trinken." It is used in this signification especially in the proceedings of the *Vereins-* or *Verbindungskneipen*, when a member is placed in B.V. (*Bierverschiss*) because of the infraction of some rule of decorum. A friend (usu-

ally a *Leibverwandter*, in student parlance) of the culprit rises and calls the attention of the *hohes Praesidium* to the fact that "—paukt sich aus dem einfachen B.V. in die Bierehrlichkeit über, wer paukt mit?" The *pauken* consists then in the dishonored student's drinking a half or whole glass of beer instantaneously, as the friend may see fit to demand. Kluge mentions this very common use of the word in student circles neither in the body of the book nor in the vocabulary. Nor does he notice the use, peculiar to the *Kneipe*, of the words *steigen* and *fallen*, which the chairman uses as a sort of "Kommando" at the beginning and close of each song. After the cord has been struck on the piano, the chairman rising shouts, "das Lied steigt," then, on taking up the last stanza of the song, "das Lied fällt."

Many of the familiar expressions now used everywhere in Germany in card-playing owe their extensive use in the *Umgangssprache* to the students, who, it seems, took up the words from *Rotwelsch*, or the *Gaunersprache*. On p. 59 f., Kluge remarks in speaking of the influence of *Rotwelsch* upon the academic language:

Neben dem Latein und der Theologie ist das Rotwelsch eine Quelle der Studentensprache. Wir kennen diese Gaunersprache seit dem 14-15. Jahrhundert aus reichhaltigeren und vielseitigeren Aufzeichnungen als die Burschensprache; für jedes Jahrhundert stehen uns rotwelsche Wortmaterialien zu Gebote und wir sehen überrascht, dass manche später als studentisch verzeichnete Worte zuerst Gaunerworte des Rotwelsch gewesen sind . . . . . *Blech* wird für 'Geld' schon in Corn. Gessners Mithridates 1555 als rotwelsch verzeichnet und *pumpen* erscheint zuerst in der rotwelschen Grammatik von 1755, dann erst 1781 und 1795 in studentikosen Wörterbüchern . . . . . Am Schluss des 18. Jahrhunderts tritt *mogeln* in studentischen Wörterbüchern und in Fischers komischer Burschiade von 1781 auf; aber es ist Judenwort und bezeichnete eigentlich das Beschneiden, Einkneifen der Karten zum Zweck des Betrügens."

Here it would have been in place for Kluge to call attention, at least in a foot-note, to several other words used at cards, which are not explained in the usually accessible dictionaries. These words are especially *mauern* (cf. Engl. 'to hedge'); that is, to hold back, or refuse to play a card to the best advantage in *Skat*; *wimmeln*, *einwimmeln* (to throw the

heavy or counting cards on a partner's trick); *Vosen* (or *fauxen*; French *faux*?), a term applied to all spot cards below the ten-spot. It may be that all the words just mentioned are of some other than academic origin, but their general use by students at the present day, even more than by any other class of German society, and the fact that they are not to be found in other dictionaries of the German language, would seem to call for at least a notice in a work that deals especially with the *Studentensprache*.

However, after all has been said about the few weak points of the book, it is a splendid specimen of the author's painstaking scholarship; and it is moreover a perfect storehouse of interesting information for the student of German. No lexicographer of the German language can hereafter fail to make large use of it in the preparation of a complete dictionary.

W. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE AUTHORSHIP OF FLAMENCA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—On page vi of his introduction to the novel *Flamenca*, Paul Meyer writes as follows:

"En admettant même que les faits accéssoires du roman puissent n'être point dépourvus de fondement, il restera encore une assez belle part à la fantaisie. Et d'abord, le procédé ingénieux que Guillaume imagine pour converser avec sa dame est une conception que je revendique pour notre romancier. Aussi loin que s'étendent mes informations, je ne vois point que personne s'en soit avisé avant lui, ni après."

The ingenious proceeding alluded to refers to a dialogue taking place between Guillaume de Nevers and Flamenca, the principal characters of the novel. Lord Archimbaut, count of Bourbon and Flamenca, are husband and wife. Archimbaut is jealous of his wife and resolves to keep her a close prisoner in a tower. Only on high feast days will he allow her to go to church to hear mass. Guillaume de Nevers, who comes to town, learns of Archimbaut's cruelties to his wife; he will seek to gain



Flamenca's confidence and in this way punish Archimbaut for his misdeeds. To this end he succeeds in getting himself installed as clerk of the church, and when Archimbaut and Flamenca come to hear mass, he shows them to their pew. Flamenca is not a little surprised when she hears Guillaume say "Alas!" She is however so closely guarded by her husband that it is impossible for her to speak a word to Guillaume, and one whole week must elapse before she can again come to church and see him. In her endeavors to explain the reason for the 'Alas!' she concludes he is some person seeking to comfort her, and the following Sunday on entering into the church and on being led to her pew by Guillaume, she asks "What troubles you?" A word, a syllable is all they can say at a time; and their conversation continues in that way until at last they come to some understanding. Grouping together the different parts of the conversation, we constitute the following dialogue: *Guillaume*. Ailas! *Flamenca*. Que plans? G. Mor mi. F. De que? G. D'amor. F. Per cui? G. Per vos. F. Qu'en puesc? G. Garir. F. Consi? G. Peir gein. F. Pren li. G. Pres l'ai. F. E cal? G. Iretz. F. Es on? G. Als banz. F. C'ora? G. Jorn bren e gent. F. Plas mi.

With this, compare the last two stanzas of a poem by Peire Rogier, p. 82, Bartsch, *Chrestomathie Provençale*. The coincidence in spirit and in word even, between the *Flamenca* dialogue and Rogier's poem is most striking. There is no positive evidence telling us when Peire Rogier was born or when he died—at least, not so far as I have been able to find out. Diez says that P. R. was born about 1160-80; a bit of a biography we have of the poet would at least point to the conclusion that he must have been a man at least forty years old when he died, for there is internal evidence in his poetry which proves to my entire satisfaction that no younger man could have written it. On the other hand, we are told that *Flamenca* was written during the twelfth century, perhaps the early part of the thirteenth, not later than 1220 according to some, yet according to others, possibly as late as 1250. *Flamenca* may, therefore, have been written during the life-time of Peire Rogier.

Paul Meyer undoubtedly knew this poem but perhaps he had forgotten it when he wrote his introduction to *Flamenca*. Who is the author of *Flamenca*? According to Paul Meyer, one of the numerous troubadours who, during the thirteenth century, wandered about under the name of *Bernard*. And why? Oh! because the author of *Flamenca*, after eulogizing the character of his hero, *Guillaume de Nevers*, gets angry with him because he loves *Bernardet* not enough. It is true, to hold off a storm of criticism arising from such assumption, P. Meyer adds that his hypothesis is based on such uncertain ground that it would be useless either to attack it or cling to it.

Is there not at least as much, perhaps more reason to surmise that Peire Rogier and the author of *Flamenca* look very much alike?

THÉODORE HENCKELS.

Middlebury College.

#### A CORRECTION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Among the quotations relative to the misplacement of *only* printed in MOD. LANG. NOTES, for March, 1895, there is the following misquotation: "'... the diffidence which becomes a judge who has only heard but one side.' Macaulay, *Bertrand Barère*."

The presence of the *but* in this passage leads me to compare the supposed quotation, as cited in MOD. LANG. NOTES, with the text of Macaulay's essay as printed in an edition of his miscellaneous works at hand. In the essay on "Barère's Memoirs," as there printed, the passage appears in this form:

"... the diffidence which becomes a judge who has heard only one side."—"Critical and Miscellaneous Essays by T. Babington Macaulay, New and Revised Edition" (D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1879), vol. v., p. 151.

Accepting this text as probably correct, we see that the *but* in the citation is intrusive and that *only* is misplaced. It is this second error that I am especially anxious to point out and correct; for the corrupt passage was ranged by me with quotations illustrative of the fact that a certain collocation of *only* often censured by critics, as involving a misplacement, is so



cited but is citable on the other side. The quotation, as first copied by me, is not at hand, and the memorandum at present accessible does not show the edition of Macaulay's writings from which it was taken. As to the intrusive *but*, it is not in the manuscript from which the typewritten copy was made for the press. I do not know positively whether or not it was in that typewritten copy, because the typewritten copy is not now in my possession.

R. O. WILLIAMS.

New York.

#### BOOKS PRINTED IN ICELAND.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I desire to call your attention to the very remarkable catalogue just issued by the Skandinavisk Antiquariat, in Copenhagen, of a collection of books printed in Iceland from 1584 to 1844. The catalogue contains, chronologically arranged under the different places of publication, no less than one hundred and sixty-eight titles, or more than one quarter of the whole number comprised within the same period as contained in Lidderdale's *Catalogue of the Books printed in Iceland from A. D. 1578 to 1880 in the Library of the British Museum* (1885), and in the three supplements to it compiled by Professor Willard Fiske (1886-90). The terminal dates of the present catalogue are those of the first Icelandic Bible, a copy of which is offered in this collection, and the year of the removal of the then only existing press in Iceland from Viðey to Reykjavik, a *terminus ad quem* used and justified by Professor Fiske in his bibliography. The collection includes not only Bishop Guðbrand's Bible of 1584, but Bishop Thorlák's of 1644, and Bishop Stein's of 1728. It contains, besides, to cite a few titles almost at random, the rare *Paradisar Likell* of 1686, the *Jónsbók* of 1707, the *Víjsna-Book* of 1748, and superb black-letter editions of the Sagas like the *Skálholt Olaf Saga Tryggvasonar* and the *Landnámabók* of 1688, and the *Hólar Fornmanna Sögur* and *Marg-Frooder Sögu-pættur* of 1756. Such an opportunity as is here presented to libraries and individual collectors can not, from the very nature of the case, frequently occur. Most of the books listed do not often come upon the market and some of

them not at all; and it is safe to assert that such a collection as this has never before been offered for sale. The Catalogue may be had gratis by writing to the Skandinavisk Antiquariat, 49 Gothersgade, Copenhagen.

WM. H. CARPENTER.

Columbia College.

#### DIES GESCHLECHT.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—It seems to me that another interpretation is to be placed upon the phrase, *Dies Geschlecht*, than that given in the review of Carruth's *Wallenstein*, (March 1895, p. 85), where it is said to mean "'this race (of ours),' i. e. mankind in general." It is a familiar biblical expression, applied (Hebrews iii, 10) to the children of Israel: "Darum ich entrüstet ward über dies Geschlecht," and would seem rather to mean 'a perverse group or class.' In the passage commented on (*Wall. Tod*, i, 7) 'this class' has reference to intriguing courtiers; in another passage in the same play, (v, 4):

Dies Geschlecht

Kann sich nicht anders freuen als bei Tisch

the term refers to men of the stamp of Illo and Terzky, 'men of this sort.'

JAMES T. HATFIELD.

Northwestern University.

#### BRIEF MENTION.

The latest *Kort Udsigt over det Philologisk-Historiske Samfunds Virksomhed, Octobr, 1891-Octobr, 1894*, is of special interest as marking the fortieth anniversary of this flourishing Danish society. The pamphlet, which is much larger than usual, includes, in addition to the titles of all papers presented during the last three years, and abstracts of some of them, the title page and table of contents for 1883-1894, forming the second volume of proceedings. In the short preface, a general account is given of the progress of the society during the period under consideration, from which it appears that the R. K. Rask's *Legal* has now reached the desired amount of 2000 kr. A description is given of the *Studies* published by the society, one of which, *Chaucers Liv og Digting*, was reviewed in this journal. (Vol. viii, p. 158.)

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1895.

## HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE DANISH LANGUAGE.

THE Danish Language is one of the four into which the mother tongue of the North was gradually divided; it is not only the spoken and literary language of Denmark, but, in conformity with her political union with Norway towards the end of the fourteenth century, it became the literary language in that country also.

We find the most ancient remains of the Danish language on our few monuments that are inscribed with the so-called older Runes, of which monuments the Golden Horn is especially famous. The inscription on this dates from about 500 A.D. and runs:—"ek HlewagastiR HoltingaR horna tawido" ('Ich Liegast Holting made this Horn'). This form of language is so old that we have here not merely the original tongue for all the newer northern languages, but find also, in many cases, the same forms which must once have been common to all Germanic peoples. These forms are older than those that are known from Wulfilas' contemporary translation of the Bible into the Gothic language, in which the inscription of the Golden Horn would have taken the following form:—"ik Hliugasts Hultiggs haurn tawida."

A considerable number of inscriptions in the ordinary, more recent Runic alphabet follow, in Denmark, the scanty remains of inscriptions in the older Runes. In these inscriptions, the language as well as the Runic forms has undergone important changes; yet in the tenth century Danish is in all essentials still one with Norse, whilst the language on our Runic stones of the tenth century agrees in all points with that which rang through the contemporary Norwegian-Icelandic songs of the Skalds. For an example of this we select the inscription on the Glavendruper Stone on Fünen. It dates from the beginning of the tenth century, and if we give for each Rune the alphabetical letter which nearest expresses its sound value, it will read as follows:—'Ragnhildr satti stain þannsi øft Ála Sálwa

goða, wia haiðwerðan þegn. Ála syniR gaerðu kumbl þausi øft fæður sfnn auk hans kuna øft wer sfnn; en Sóti raist rúnaR þássi øft dróttin sfnn. Þórr wígi þássi rúnaR!'

("Ragnhild erected this stone to Ale the Salve-Goden, the famous guardian of the temple. Ale's sons made this monument to their father, and his wife to her husband; but Sote scratched these Runes to his lord. May Thor hallow these Runes!")

With the exception of some older forms (*satti*=*setti*; *þannsi*, *passi*=*penna*, *þessi*, *þessar*), this language agrees as good as completely with the form of language in the oldest known Icelandic manuscripts. That the language in Denmark down to about the year 1000 differed from the language of the rest of the North only in the smallest non-essentials is shown by the inscription on the great Jaellinger Stone which dates from the end of the tenth century and runs:—"Haraldr konungR bað gārwa kumbl þausi æft Gorm faður sfnn auk æft þyrwi móður sína, sá Haraldr es sér wann Danmârk alla auk Norweg auk Dani gærði kristna. ("King Harald commanded this monument to be erected to Gorm his father and to Thyra his mother—that Harald who conquered all Denmark and Norway and brought the Danes to Christianity.")

About the year 1000, however, a peculiar sound transition made its appearance (somewhat later showing itself in Swedish also), whilst the old diphthongs became transformed into long, simple vowels: *ai* into *e*, *au* and *ey* into *ø*: *stainn*>*stenn*, *dauðr*>*døðr*, *heyra*>*høra*. The first great division within the northern tongue began with these transitions, through which Dano-Swedish became opposed to Norwegian-Icelandic. Unfortunately we have only very few monuments which show the development of the Danish language from the middle of the eleventh to the end of the thirteenth century. It most clearly appears, however, from our oldest written monuments that just at this period the language had developed faster. These monuments are principally from the most ancient manuscripts of our old provincial laws (the Schonish, the two Seelandish, and the Jutish)—and, in round numbers, may have been composed about the



year 1300. The language of this period stands forth in three chief dialects: the Schonish, the Seelandish, and the Jutish. On the other hand, a joint literary language was still unknown, but each province used its own dialect, which it sought to form into a common literary language for the entire province. About the year 1300, no slight changes had developed within the separate provincial dialects themselves. This clearly appears from the condition of things in Jutland, the oldest manuscripts there represent a common Jutish provincial language, whilst the contemporary manuscripts of the Flensburger municipal laws are markedly Anglian.

In opposition to Old Norse, the above-mentioned transition of the old diphthongs into single vowels about the year 1300, is common to all Danish dialects (*eth*=*eidr*; *lɔs*=*lauss*; *lɔsæ*=*leysa*), also, the loss of the *h* before *l*, *n*, *r* (*lɔpæ*=*hlaupa*); the loss of the modification of the *u* (land, plur. land=Old N. land, plur. lɔnd); the loss of the modification of the *i* in the Optative of the preterite (*waræ*, *tokæ*=Old N. *væri*, *tœki*) and in the sing. of the ind. present (in this, however Jutish has kept the modification in individual cases: *gær* and *gængær* by the side of *gar* and *gængær*, which is arbitrary in Schonish; unmodified forms in Seelandish seem to rest on Jutish influence); the disuse of the *r* in the nom. sing. of Substantives, which, by this means agrees with the accusative; (*arf*=old Norse *arfr* and *arf*); both these cases agree also in the plural *arfæ* (*a*)=Old Norse *arfarr* and *arfa*; *synær* (*ir*)=Old Norse *synir* and *sunu*). In opposition to modern Danish all the dialects have still preserved *k*, *t*, *p*, and *gh* as the concluding sound where we now have *g*, *d*, *b*; *j*, *v*, (*takæ*, *utæn*, *tapæ*, *wægh*, *logh*=*tage*, *uden*, *tabe*; *Vej*, *Lov*); *th* as the initial sound (*thing*=*Ting*; *thæn*=*den*); the minute distinction between *nn* (*n*) and *nd*, *ll* (*l*) and *ld* (*tan*, *land*=*Tand*, *Land*; *ællæ*, *wald*=*Ælde*, *Vold*).

The most essential difference between the dialects themselves consists in this that the Schonish preserves *a*, *i* (*e*), *u*, (*o*) in the terminations, whilst the Seelandish and Jutish have taken *æ*; but in Jutish even this has often been lost. Moreover, the Schonish has

kept the dative form which, on the contrary, has fallen into disuse in Jutish and, as a rule, in Seelandish. The result of these two differences is that Schonish remains much nearer to Old Norse than does Seelandish and more particularly than Jutish.

To the language within this epoch (Older Danish) follows a period (Old Danish) of transition and fermentation. This period dates from the middle of the fourteenth and lasts throughout the fifteenth century and, during it, the development into New Danish was completed. The characteristically distinguishing mark between the language of this and the preceding period, must be mentioned in the transition in the system of sounds of *k*, *t*, *p* and *gh*, to *g*, *d*, *b*; *j*, *v*, in the concluding sounds; of *th* (*p*) to *t*, *d* in the initial sounds; and the intermixture of *nn* and *nd*, *ll* and *ld*. These and other less essential sound transitions, cause the orthography of this period to be extraordinarily mixed and capricious. This arises from the fact that the sound sometimes expresses the old pronunciation, sometimes denotes the new: and frequently a blending of the old and new together; for example, the word *Lav*, older *lagh*, can be written *lagh*, *law*, *lau*, *lawgh*, or *laugh*. The new forms force themselves more and more into the inflections; the difference between masculine and feminine is often abolished; *s* becomes the universal sign of the possessive case both in the singular and plural: and other similar changes take place. Nevertheless, many old forms are still found side by side with the new, and several transition forms, which stand as intermediaries between the Old and New Danish, are peculiar to this epoch. Thus by the side of the new genitive plural *mæns* we find, not merely the old *mannæ*, but also *mæn* without the sign of the possessive.

Lastly, a great and thorough change in the vocabulary of the language showed itself during this period; it left deep traces behind, and has impressed its stamp on the language down to the present day. The foreign elements that can be shown to exist earlier in the language are, with few exceptions; only Latin words or Greek words in a Latinized form; they had already penetrated singly in heathen times (Ark, Kjedel, etc.), but most of them



came in with Christianity (Kirke, Kloster, Alter, Chor, Font; Biskop, Præst, Munk, Degn, Capel, Capellan; Engel, Djævel, Messe, Skrift, skrifte, pine; Paaske, Pinse). On the other hand, in the more ancient period it was only exceptionally that one word and another was adopted from the German language; and for the most part, these words were titles (Herre, Frue, Jomfru, Junker, Hertug, Greve). In the present period, on the contrary, the German influence maintains its full force. In consequence of the many collisions with Germany, and especially on account of the too powerful influence of the Hanse towns, Danish (and also Swedish and Norwegian) was flooded by a mighty torrent from Germany. This torrent brought with it a countless host of Low-German words and of Romance words that had been adopted into Low German. These words belong to those in most common use at the present day. Examples of this are adduced from the different parts of speech: at blive, ske, begynde, Begyndelse, bör ('det bör sig,' 'som det sig hör og bör'), Brug, bruge, Arbejde, at arbejde, mene, Raab, raabe, Haab, haabe, skaane, Skaansel, vove, regere (usually regnere), krænke, Tvil (now Tvivl), tvile (now tvivle), styrtte, sluge, Smag, smage, tære, tøve, pleje (1. to be accustomed, 2. to tend), øve (sig i) fægte, jage, feje, skure, Bulder, buldre, knage, Suk, sukke, Skum, skumme; fri Frihed, fremmed, klog, Daare, fals(k), Fals(k) and Fals(k)hed, dejlig, græselig, klar, fin, gjæv (that is, excellent admirable), kysk, ædel, stiv, stolt, grov, svag, smal, kort, from, kjön (both with the signification 'brave') smuk, skjön, -agtig, (blødagtig, livatig), -færdig (hoffærdig, retfærdig), sagte, sagtmodig, bange, rede (til), idel, lutter, saadan, trind, trindt omkring, omtrent, föje (opportune); trifling), Föje, med Föje, at föje; Lempe, med Lempe, at lempe, lempelig, Kaar, kaare, (also kese), Vilkaar, Hob, til Hobe, Del, dels, aldeles, Fordel, Lykke, Æventyr, Formue, Klenodie, Billed, Pund, Pant, Hast, med (i) Hast, Angst, Frygt, frygte, Fare, Stank, stinke, Agt, agte, Magt, mægtig, Flugt, Tilflugt, Frugt, Lugt (as well with the meaning 'odour' as 'air'), lugte, Tugt, tugtig, tugte, Rygte, Pligt, pligtig, Slægt, Maaltid (Aftenmaaltid = Aftensmad),

Frokost, Fastelavn, Selskab, Herskab, -mager (Skomager), Frøken, Fruentimmer, Tvilling, Borgere, Foged, Fuldmægtig, Formyndere, Helled (now Helt), Krig, Orlog, Kiv, Tvedragt, Slot, Hof, Høvisk, Forrædere, Skalk (that is, 'rogue'), Hingst, Æsel, Rotte, Papegöje ('skyde Papegöjen'), Krybbe, Snude, Næb, Stemme, Kunst, Redskab, Skorsten, Ror (that is, 'rudder'), Kurv, Stövle, Buxer, Tröje; alligevel, jo, tilforn, forgjæves, ganske (usually gantzæ). Besides a multitude of others with the prefix *be-* (*bi*), *for-*, *und-* and with the suffix *-hed*, which is usually joined to a word of Norse origin (bedrove, befale, behage, Behov, behove, begjære, Besded, beskjærme, beskrive, bestaa, betale, betænke, bevare, bevise, betyde; bilægge, bistaa, Bistand; forbarme sig, fordrage, fordrive, fordætte, formene, fornemme, forstaa, forstyrre; undfly, undgaa, undkomme, undlobe, undsige, undskylde, undslippe, undsætte, undvige; Hoffærdighed, Klarhed, Kyskhed, Hoviskhed, Kjærlighed, Laded, Mildhed, Sandhed, Ydmyghed, etc.). A Danish (Norwegian) word is frequently supplanted by a nearly related or almost consonant Low-German word (Dandemand, Danne-mand for dughændæ man, Del for deld=Old N. deild, dog (at) for tho (at)=Old N. þo (at), Stef-fader, etc. for stiup- styp-, Telt for tjæld), or a pure Danish word receives a German suffix (Retvished, Snildhed for the old rætvisæ, snillæ=Old N. rettvishi, snilli; Tyveri for thiufnæth), or compound forms arise through the reverse arrangement (Vægt from Low-German wicht and Old-Danish wæt). If we add to this that Danish words frequently change their meaning under the influence of Low German, it will become clear how much this intermingling has taken hold of the whole structure of the language. In the beginning, of course, the pure Danish words are nearly related to the Low-German, but the latter gradually triumph as a rule (Arbejde for æwæthæ, begynde for byriæ, blive and ske for worthæ, kurv for lob, Lugt and Smag for don and tæv (Thæf), Pant for wæth, raabæ, for obæ; Sprog, Rejse, at rejse, which later became universal, still appear by the side of the old Maal, Færd, at fare; in this, and in other individual cases, the Danish and German word have been preserved

side by side to the present day: Falsk and Svig, Frokost and Davre, Frygt, frygte and Rædsel, ræddes, Slot and Borg, Stemme and Røst, Æsel and Asen, etc.

Many of the Low-German words (especially in legal documents and translations from the German) which appear in the literature of this time were certainly never in common use in every-day language; and later on many of them were again supplanted by Norse or High-German words, or changed in other ways. Thus, a multitude of words with the prefix *be-*, etc., disappeared; *kjær*, *kjærlig* supplanted *lef*, *levelig*, and so on; *Luft* took the place of *Lugt*, and in this case we now have both the Low-German and High-German word but with different signification; *Stift* and *stifte* for *Stigt* and *stigte*, *erhverv* succeeding to *forhverve*, *Klogskab* to *Kloghed*, and so forth; *Naktegal*, which was adopted into Old Danish from Low German became transformed into *Nattergal*, *ombære* became *undvære*, etc.; transition of meaning appears in *from*, *kjön*, and many other words. But, nevertheless, such deep traces have been left behind by the German influence of this period, that they can never be thoroughly effaced from our vocabulary.

Yet, in one respect, a difference shows itself between the language of this and earlier times and in a progress towards New Danish. Whilst the monuments of the earlier periods give the dialects of the different provinces with all their idiomatic characteristics, now we are met by a struggle to avoid some strongly marked dialectic characteristics; thus the Jutish *æc* or *ac* becomes supplanted by *ieg*. Nevertheless, a common literary Danish language had not yet developed; as in earlier periods, we can still point out the three chief dialects in the literary monuments of this time; namely, Schonish, Seelandish and Jutish.

On the attempt, which was made at the time of the Union, to provide a common Dano-Swedish literary language we need not dwell; happily for both languages, it led to nothing; nevertheless, it has left traces in the Swedish language, which, on the contrary, has not been the case in Danish.

The tolerably large poetical and prose literature, which is handed down to us as a picture

of the language of this period, exists mostly in translations: knightly romances in rhyme and prose, books of travel, a multitude of religious writings, etc. The later manuscripts of the old provincial laws form a continuation of the national literature of the preceding period; to them may be added a great number of other legal writings (municipal laws, regulations of guilds, and documents of different kinds). As especially important monuments in which the language often takes a higher elevation, we call particular attention to the Danish Rhyming Chronicle, and the poems of the priest, Micheal, the Seer of Iden. In their grammatical form (the Island Dialect), both of them are nearer to the literary language of the present day than either the Jutish or Schonish monuments of the language of that period. We must not forget, moreover, that side by side with the written literature there existed many poems, which, for generations were transmitted from mouth to mouth; namely, the ballads of the people; and these, although they were first noted down in the sixteenth century, yet, in many ways, can also throw light upon the language of this time.

Meanwhile, the impulse towards a common literary language which should gradually supplant the dialects, became more and more apparent; but it appears a struggle for the pre-eminence in this respect was long carried on between Jutish and Seelandish. As is well known, this struggle ended at the Reformation with the complete victory of the Seelandish, which, from this time, was raised to the position of a common Danish literary language. The Danish translation of the Bible of the year 1550 (Christian III's Bible) must be mentioned as the work which, so to say, gave to the literary language its official stamp. This translation, which is an exact reproduction of the German translation of Luther, resulted from the combined labors of several of the most able men and best stylists of the time, and is noteworthy for its remarkably pure and flowing language, and, in comparison with the previous confusion, for its most consistent orthography. In connection with this translation of the Bible, we must call special attention not only to Christian Pedersen, as the man



who, of all the distinguished Danish stylists of the time of the Reformation, had the most important share in it, but also to Peder Palladius, to whom next to Chr. Pedersen this translation is without doubt most indebted, to Hans Tavsén and Povl Helgesen (Paulus Eliæ). The language of the two first-named writers is nearer to the language of the present day than that of the remaining important authors of the Reformation; this naturally follows, in no slight degree, from the circumstance that the language of the Bible was their language also.

Somewhat later in A. S. Vedel, we meet with a man who also had an essential influence on the development of the literary language; in particular through his translation of Saxo (1575). This translation was the first great non-theological prose work in which, after the Reformation, the Danish language resounded smooth and pure. The same praise that is bestowed on Vedel for his pure and flowing language, is due also to his contemporary, the Norwegian Priest, Peder Claussøn Friis, the translator of the Norwegian *Saga of the King*.

With the eminent Danish authors of the Reformation begins that period in the history of the language named Modern Danish, because the system of sounds and forms had now attained, in all essentials, the same stability as in our day. Nevertheless, a series of older forms which were later altered or wholly relinquished, divide the language of the time of the Reformation from that of to-day. As the most important of these forms we note the following: neuter plural without termination in forms such as *land, hus, træ; hiærte, hige* (=Lande, Træer, etc.); the termination *-ere* for *-er* in words like *dommere*, etc.; gen. sing. in permanent forms in *-sens, -ens*; as, for example, *barnsens, landsens, brødsens* and *brødens, kødens* (=Barnets, etc.); change of the vowel in the singular and plural preterite (*bandt-bunde, drak-drukke*); forms of the present tense as *skin, meen, far, stril, blæss* (=skinner, etc.); 2nd. pers. sing. of the Imperative in *-e* in *kalde, suare*, etc. (now *kald, svar*); preterite and participle in *-te, -t* for newer *-ede, et*; as, *løsste, løsst, miste, mist, kaste, kast*; the termination *-t* in the 2nd. pers. present tense, *vilt, kant, skalt, maat*; *-st*

into *-est, tørst, vedst*, and in the preterite of the strong verbs (*gaffst, drogst, løbst*, etc.); and the preservation of the optative preterite (*vunde, vaare, toge*).

A remarkable retrogression in the treatment of the language already began to be shown by Vedel's immediate successors, Arild Huitfeldt and C. C. Lyskander. A longer period now follows wherein Latin stood pre-eminent as the language of the learned, and the Danish language, existing in a narrow and insignificant state, was but little cultivated or improved.

Nevertheless, that its voice could ring, pure and clear even in the middle of the Latin period, is shown by the excellent works of this time in poetry and in prose. We only need to remember the names of Anders Arrebo, Anders Bording, Thomas Kingo, the Norwegian Petter Dass, Birgitte Thott (translation of Seneca, 1658) and Leonora Christine (*Jammersminde*); and, finally, Christian V.'s *Danish Laws* (1683) which are even classical in language and contents. Yet in energy and strength, in purity and ease of style, the language of this time, even in the most excellent writings, can compare only exceptionally with that which had previously flowed from the pens of Chr. Pedersen and P. Palladius, Vedel and P. Claussøn. We get a powerful impression of the universal condition of the language when we listen to the repeated complaints over its degradation, and when we see with what difficulties Peder Syv, its most zealous advocate in the last half of the seventeenth century, had to struggle, in order to express his thoughts in his mother tongue. His avowal in the preface to *Den Danske Sprog-Kunst* is significant in this respect; "Sometimes an entire sentence is given in Latin, in order that it may be the better understood."

Hence, the language which Holberg found in existence on his appearance, was little improved, and in many respects, poor and unwieldy. It could scarcely have been believed that the language possessed the capacity, to render not only all that was in agitation in its native country, but also the many partly new thoughts and ideas which had found expression in the rest of Europe. Such was the case, however; the language contained all



the germs within itself which were necessary for its complete development and blossom if a great mind used it and bent it to his thoughts. Holberg proved this by his magnificent literary activity, which in many respects created a national literature anew. Holberg had set himself two tasks: to teach his countrymen; and to polish his native language; it is well known that in both he succeeded to a remarkable degree. Still, it cannot be denied that, in spite of its many great and unmistakeable excellences, Holberg's language is very far removed from the Danish of the present day. The whole style of it, and the hosts of foreign (Franco-Latin) words, give it a color very unlike that of our modern language.

Nevertheless, as early as Holberg's time, the impulse was given to the great change which led to the formation of the modern Danish literary language. This change gradually grew out of the purification of the language which was begun by Eilschov (1747), and carried on by J. S. Sneedorf (*Den patriotiske Tilskuers* 1761-63); it evoked a lively controversy, which excited the popular interest to such a degree, that it was even brought on the stage (through Charlotte Dorothea Biehl's comedy, *Haarkløveren*, 1765). The result of this controversy was the removal from the language of a great number of the earlier borrowed French and Latin words and the formation, modelled on the German, of a multitude of new words, particularly for abstract ideas, which are still for the most part in common use. The following words belong to those overrated by Eilschov: Bogsal, Høresal, Enkelthed, Hvilepunkt, Jordlag, Kunstdommer, Kunstner, Omkreds, Overflade, Retslærd, Selvstændighed, Tonekunst, Tvangslov, Valsprog. Other sources of enrichment of the mother tongue and of the suppression of foreign words are: the Old Norse, the Old Danish, the other northern languages, and the Danish dialects. In our century these sources are copiously drawn upon, but in those days they were very sparingly used. The word *Æmne*, however, was adopted from the Swedish and Gaade, which "was lost in Copenhagen but still commonly used in the country," from the vulgar tongue.

Stindfrosen (now stivfrosen) and ætled (for adoptere) "a very good Norwegian word," on the contrary, did not maintain their ground. Several of the old words from Vedel's translation of Saxo, however, came into use later (four, Hjemlov, Kaar, Kaare, Varetægt, værne). Many of the newer words, moreover, had to endure a long and severe struggle before they were universally employed. Holberg might well make fun of people who wrote "Monsieur" and "Franco" on a letter sent between Ringsted and Slagelse; but nevertheless, he continued to use numbers of Romance words, and in several places he declares himself against the puristic movement, already begun. In the delightful epistle (448) which, according to his own assertion (Ep. 451), was composed "in order to point out the groundless undertaking of the purists" were cited Lægekunsten, Bogsal, Høresal, Digter for Medicinen, Bibliothek, Auditorium, Poët, amongst other "awkward and unintelligible" words. Subjects for Ch. Biehl's sarcasm are, for example, besjæles af noget, Bestræbelse, beundre, Beundring, Bisag, Fordom, Fornemmelse, Gjenstand, indsigtsfuld, Kunstdommer, Lidenskab, Omdømme, overdreven, Overlæg, Smag, udaande, Vindesyge, virksom, and Ærefrygt. According to the testimony of Sneedorf and J. Baden, the words beundre, bedømme, Ærfrygt had been the subject of conversation in all social gatherings, and the objects of many jests, before they became current language. In 1793 Eler still marks Lidenskab and Gjenstand as "new-coined words of foreign origin" which were expelled from the dictionaries of learned societies "with just censure"; in 1799 J. Baden says that a greater part of the French words earlier brought into use are supplanted by "good and honest Danish" ones, so that now one rarely sees "absurd, Absurditet, admirere, præferere, excellere, producere and a thousand others"; but he adds, "we shall never root them out from the colloquial language;" and as an example he cites the work *Kjærtegn*, which "will never drive the French caresse from the colloquial language," in particular, because one can form the verb *caressere* from the last, whilst scarcely any one would use *kjærtegne*. Now, however *Kjær-*

tegn as well as *kjærtegne* have completely driven out *Caresse* and *caressere*.

Of course many of the words formed at that time never came into universal use, or were relinquished later (Forevendig, now Paaskud) or changed in various ways; some received another suffix: Erfaring for Erfarenhed, Forvirring for Forvirrelse, Undersøgelse for Undersøgning; several unconnected words blended into one: Bevæggrund for bevægende Grund, Skjönaand for skjön Aand, Fattigvæsen for de Fattiges Væsen. But the design of Eilschov and Sneedorf was carried out, in general and upon a large scale, and at the same time, the last understood how to mould his language so that in style as well as vocabulary it coincides in all essentials with that of to-day. From the time of Sneedorf's appearance, therefore, we can reckon, and not without good grounds, a new (the last) period in the history of the Danish language, which we must then name Modern Danish.

The language had shown that it possessed a remarkable power for development, and the movement thus begun has continued through the whole of the eighteenth century down to our own day. A higher poetical language was created through Ewald and Oehlenschläger, and even in strictly scientific matters, new native words were successfully formed (H. C. Ørsted, R. K. Rask). For holding fast to and leading this national movement in the language, great honor is due to the supporters of political freedom in the middle of the century, who exchanged the earlier Præsident, Comité, Amendement, Interpellation for Formand, Udvalg, Ændringsforslag, Forespørgsel, at the same time that we obtained Folketing, Landsting, Flertal, Mindretal, Dagsorden, etc.

Through great struggles and severe birth-pains, then, the Danish literary language has obtained the shape, in which it now resounds to us through a rich and many-sided literature, and to every unprejudiced observer it will be clear that a steady development is still in progress whose end is to create words as pure, as indigeneous and as markedly Danish as possible.

Contemporary with this modern develop-

ment of the Danish language is a corresponding movement in Norway with Norwegian as its aim; and the struggle there to give the literary language a distinctive Norwegian stamp, has become stronger and stronger. This movement is encouraged by the great poets, B. Björnson and H. Ibsen, and by the entire feeling of the nation; it is not only justifiable, but has been, and will continue to be, of utility for the development of the language, not only of Norway, but also of all Scandinavia, and it will still be so even if its natural result should be that the common Dano-Norwegian literary language breaks up into Danish and Norwegian.

Side by side with the common Danish literary language, the different dialects of each province are naturally still spoken, and at the present day still divided into the same three chief groups as in the Middle Ages. They are:—Bornholmish, which since the separation of Schonen from Denmark stands as the representative of East Danish; the Island Dialect (Fünish, Seelandish, etc.); and Jutish. The chief characteristics of the three groups are: the Barnholmish preserves *a* in the terminations, where the Island Dialect has obtained *e* (*æ*), whilst the Jutish has quite discarded this sound (*bæra*, *bære*, *bær*). That the Island Dialect is again separated into a multitude of sub-divisions, is easily understood.

The oldest Danish grammar is E. Pontoppidan's Latin *Grammatica Danica*, 1668. After that followed the compendious Danish works of P. Syv (*Den Danske Sprog-Kunst*, 1685) and H. T. Gerner (*Orthographia Danica*, 1679, *Epitome Philologiæ Danicæ*, 1690). Through his gift of keen observation, the grammatical works of J. Höysgaard, the discoverer of the nature of sound, take a high and peculiar place (*Accentuered og Raisonnered Grammatica*, 1747; *Dansk Syntax*, 1752). After him must be named J. Baden (*Forelæsninger over det danske Sprog*, 1785), W. H. F. Abrahamson *Versuch einer vollständigen danischen Sprachlehre*, 1812), S. M. J. Bloch (*Fuldstændig Dansk Sproglære*, 1817), R. Rask (*A Grammar of the Danish Language*, 1830). From more recent times, two works in particular by the Norwegian, J. Løkke (*Modemaaltes Formlære*, 1855) and K. Knudsen (*Haandbog i*



*Dansk-Norsk Sproglære*, 1856) deserve to be especially noted. The orthography of the language has several times called forth acrimonious and tedious struggles. R. Rask's *Videnskabelig dansk Retskrivningslære* (1826), marks an epoch in this question, but at the same time provoked a controversy, which has endured to the present day, and is not yet settled. Prosody is treated of by S. Povelsön (*Prosodia Danica*, 1671), C. A. Thortsen (*Forsøg til en Dansk Metrik*, 1833-34), and E. von der Recke (*Principerne for den danske Verskunst*, 1881).

The history of the language has only lately been made the subject of scientific treatment [R. Rask, *Den danske Grammatiks Endelser og Former af det islandske Sprog forklarede Skand. Literaturselskabs Skrifter* (17. volumes, 1820); N. M. Petersen *Det danske Sprogs Historie* (1829) a remarkable work for its time, and still in keeping with the spirit of the age; K. J. Lyngby *Udsagnsordenes bøjning i jyske lov og in den jyske sprogart*, (1863); L. Wimmer, *Navneordenes bøjning i ældre Dansk* (1868); *Den historiske sprogforskning og modersmaalet* 1868].

Only two dictionaries on the modern language have an independent importance; namely, the great, still unfinished, work of the Scientific Society, the first volume of which appeared in 1793; and C. Molbech's (1833, 2nd edition 1859). The vocabulary of the older language is worked up by G. F. V. Lund (*Det ældste danske Skriftsprogs Ordforraad* 1877; very faulty), C. Molbech (*Dansk Glossarium*, 1857-66). O. Kalkar, *Ordbog til det ældre danske Sprog*, 1881; eight parts up to the present). Hitherto, unfortunately, but little of real scientific importance has been done for the study of our dialects. F. Dyrland published a short universal *Udsigt over de danske Sprogarter* in 1857. C. Molbech's *Dansk Dialect-Lexicon* (1841), which treats of the Island and Jutish dialects, but excludes Bornholmish, contains rich materials, but in many respects is inaccurate and defective. A completed dictionary in MS. by J. C. Espersen on Bornholmish, was handed over to the Scientific Society after his death, and its publication may be expected soon. That the preference in the study of the Danish dialects was given

almost exclusively to Jutish, was grounded, for the most part, on political circumstances. The most important of the works on this dialect are: L. Varming's *Det jyske Folkesprog* (1862), which treats of the Jutish dialect in general; E. Hagerup's excellent work *Det danske Sprog i Angel* (1854; 2nd edition by K. J. Lyngby, 1867) on the language of Schleswig (South Jutish); K. J. Lyngby's *Bidrag til en sønderjysk sproglære* (1858), which must be named as marking an epoch in the treatment of the dialects of his time; J. Kok's *Det danske Folkesprog i Sønderjylland* (1863-67). Lyngby's great lexical and grammatical work on the Jutish vulgar tongue, at which he had worked for many years, was unfortunately stopped by his early death. His design, however, has been adopted by H. F. Feilberg who has almost completed a Jutish dictionary, the publication of which, it is to be hoped, will begin soon. On the contrary, no prospect exists as yet, that the long-felt want of northern researchers for a scientific compilation on the Seelandish dialects, which are especially important as sources of our literary language, will be supplied.

KARL LENTZNER.

Oxford, England.

#### MODERN FRENCH *gêne* = OLD FRENCH *gehine*, FROM *gehir*.

IN the dictionaries of Diez, Littré, Scheler and even in so recent a work as Körting's 'Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch' (Paderborn 1891), Latin GEHENNA (from Hebr. *gehinnom*) is given as the etymology of Mod. Fr. *gêne* and its derivative *gêner*. Yet a careful reader of page 47 of the second (p. 51 of the third) edition of A. Tobler's book, 'Vom französischen Versbau,' might have perceived that this scholar at least does not share the general view as to the etymology of *gêne*, when he parallels *gêne* and *reine* and their Old French forms as follows: "*gêne* : *reine* ; *jehine* : *röine*," where the spelling *j* is evidently intentional. Indeed Prof. Tobler some ten years ago expressed in my hearing the opinion that *gehine* (*jehine*), a verbal substantive from *gehir* (*jehir*), had given *gêne* just as *rëine* > *reine*, or *häine* > *haine*.



That the Old French *gehine*, with its tonic *i*, could not have its origin in GEHENNA, Scheler had not at all overlooked. In his *Dictionnaire d'Étymologie française* (3<sup>d</sup> edition, 1888) he reproaches Littré with having confounded *gehine* (confession, *aveu*) with *gehene* (torture) in the "historique" given for *gêne*. All the early examples that Littré gives (from the thirteenth century) show *gehine*. Under the "historique" of *géhénne*, he has indeed a passage from Brunetto Latini's 'Trésor' that contains "dou feu de jehenne" (misprinted *jehenne*). This learned word cannot have been much in use either; for, to say nothing of 'Li sermon Saint Bernart' and 'Die Predigten Gregors über Ezechiel,' where it does not occur, the indolent translator—if translator he can be called—of the 'Dialogue Gregoire,' who constantly transfers the Latin words of his text into the French, always has *infer* for the Latin GEHENNA. Cf., e. g., pp. 191 9.<sup>10</sup>, 259 17, 19, 20, 260 7. This means, first, that he did not know *gehene* at all, otherwise he would have used it, since it exactly corresponds to GEHENNA; and second, what is more important, that the common Old-French word *gehine*, which he must have known, had not the meaning of GEHENNA, as he would otherwise have preferred even this to *infer*.

In later times there seems to me to have been confusion indeed; not, however, in regard to the substantives, but to the verbs *gehiner* and *gehennner*, where in a great number of forms the syllable most interesting to us was not under the tonic accent.

While we cannot develop easily the meaning of the Mod. Fr. *gêne* from that of the learned word *gehene*, which is only used in the same sense as the biblical GEHENNA, *gehine* offers no difficulty in this respect, as is shown by such phrases as *metre a la gehine*=Mod. Fr. *mettre à la gêne*.

EUGENE LESER.

New York.

TWO UNEDITED CHANSONS OF  
ROBERT LA CHIÈVRE DE  
REIMS.

In announcing my intention of publishing a critical edition of the extant poems of Robert

de Reims based on the study of all the manuscripts, I am able to designate and print two chansons hitherto unpublished either in whole or in part.

Raynaud, in his *Bibliographie des Chansonniers*, names no less than five numbers, representing chansons by this poet, as unedited, viz., Nos. 35, 1510, 1852, and two which should be placed under 1163. The identity of these last two with 1163 was noted by Brakelmann in Herrig's *Archiv*, vol. 42, where they were published. Another also, 35, is to be eliminated from the number of unpublished chansons. It furnishes an instance of an interesting palaeographical error, the *r* of *rivage* being taken for *v*: an error, however, not Raynaud's originally, but that of the copyist, Sainte-Palaye transcribing probably from the manuscript now known as 1050, *nouvelle acquisition française*, lost since Sainte-Palaye's time and more lately recovered. A comparison of this manuscript with Sainte-Palaye's copy preserved at the Arsenal Library shows that the chanson 35 and that of Raynaud's appendix noted as published by Tarbé, are one and the same.

The manuscripts referred to below are denoted as follows: *A*, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 843; *C*, *ibid.* 12615; *N*, 1050 noted above. The corrections I make are mostly slight, with the intention chiefly of rectifying the metre and of filling *lacunae*. The discovery by me of the first stanza of 1510 in MSS. *AC*, not mentioned as there by Raynaud, enables me to establish the original form of the strophes, a restoration that may be easily understood from the readings given. In the present text no attempt is made to reconstruct the original orthography.

(1510 of Raynaud).

I

Main s'est levee Aeliz,  
Qui tout son cuer en deliz  
A mis et en faire joie.  
Sole tient sa voie

5 Les un pleseis.  
La chantoit une mauviz  
Qui sempre mout a enviz  
A por li ses chans feniz,  
Quant ele soz la ramee

- 10 Ot haut chanté:  
En une douce pensee  
Muie a ma volenté.

## II.

- Molt ert bele et avenant,  
Trop petite ne trop grant;  
15 Face ot blanche enluminee,  
Bouche coloree,  
Euz verz et rians,  
Gorge blanche come argenz,  
Mameletes ot poignans.

- 20 . . . . .  
Iluec s'estoit arestee,  
Molt porpensans  
De la longue demoree  
Que faisoit ses amans.

4 entire line wanting in *N*—5 *Les* wanting in *N*—7 *sempre* wanting in all three manuscripts—10 *En haut chante* *N*—12 *I jut a ma volente* *AC*—Strophe II wanting in *AC*—20 wanting in *N*—22 *Molt pensans* *N*.

(1852 OF RAYNAUD).

## I.

- Quant fueillissent li buisson  
Que naist la flor e lunc pré  
Que chantent cil oisselon  
Contre le tens et la saison d'esté;  
5 Chanter m'estuet par raison.  
Qu'Amors le m'ont dit et comandé,  
Qui mon cuer ont detenu en prison.  
Et grant piece a m'ont afié  
De m'on rendre guerredon  
10 A ma volenté.  
Et si m'ont doné un don  
Que par droit puis bien chanter,  
En non Dieu je m'en dueil  
Et debris d'amer.

## II.

- 15 Lonc tens servies les ai  
D'entier cuer fin et joiant,  
Et encor les servirai  
Por atendre le guerredon plus grant.  
Se la bele qui j'aim tant  
20 De s'amor ne m'aproche autrement,  
Mon cuer ensuit retraire sans delai.  
En vain ai servi longuement,  
N'oncor pas ne m'en repent,  
Ne ja ne ferai.  
25 Se g'ensi n'en puis joir

Dire porrai sans mentie :  
Et li verz glaioloi  
M'a tōlu m'amie.

2 e lunt pre—28 monami.

A. B. SIMONDS.

Paris.

SOME VERBAL RESEMBLANCES IN  
THE ORLANDO FURIOSO AND  
THE DIVINA COMMEDIA.

THAT the *Orlando Furioso* of Ariosto is crowded with imitations of other writers was noticed almost as soon as it was published. Already, in 1540 Fausto da Longiano wrote his *Citatione de luochi, onde tolsero Le Materie il conte Matteo Maria, e M. Ludovico*, and from that time on many monographs have been written to show Ariosto's indebtedness to Greek, Roman and later writers.\*

Attention has been called by others to resemblances between certain portions of the *Divine Comedy* and *Orlando Furioso*,—especially the account of Hell, the Terrestrial Paradise and the Moon in Canto xxxiv, where not only the general description follows more or less closely that of the great Florentine, but often the very same words are used. There are, moreover, many minor touches which have evidently been suggested by the *Divine Comedy*; as, for instance, the fierce invective against avarice (Canto xliii, 1-4), the sculptures on the fountain of Merlin (xxvi, 30), Fortune turning her wheel, (xlv, 1). Many metaphors, figures and incidents drawn from classic sources occur both in Dante and Ariosto, and yet the latter resembles the former so closely that we must believe his language was more or less influenced by his predecessor. Thus the description of the Harpies (xxxiii, 120) though based of course on Vergil, resembles very closely that of the Inferno xiii, 13-15.

It is not my intention to discuss the above class of resemblances, but simply to give a list of passages in the *Orlando Furioso* which exemplify what may be called the unconscious influence exerted by Dante on the diction

\*See for a list of these writers, Rajna, *Le Fonti dell' Orlando Furioso*, Firenze, 1876.

of Ariosto. An English writer of to-day, thoroughly versed in the Bible, Shakspeare and other writers, will often quite unconsciously weave into his own language words, sentences or fragments of sentences, which have become common property; in similar manner Ariosto, who seems to have known the *Divine Comedy* almost by heart, uses certain words, lines and expressions which fell

*Orlando Furioso.*

Erto è quel sasso sì, . . .  
Che non vi può salir chi non è augello.  
ii, 44.

E cada come corpo morto cade.  
*Ibid*, 55.

E ritrovossi in una selva oscura.  
*Ibid*, 68.  
(see also xxiii, 32)

La bella terra che siede sul fiume  
(Ferrara on the Po). iii, 34.

Vi sorge in mezzo un sasso. . .  
.....  
Non faccia, chi non vola, andarvi stima.  
iv, 12.

Con larghe ruote in terra a porsi veune,  
*Ibid*, 24.

Ch' in eterno da te non fia divisa.  
*Ibid*, 61.

Perchè egli mostrò amarmi più che molto  
Io ad amar lui con tutto il cor mi mossi.  
v. 8.

Come ceppo talor, che le medolle  
Rare e vote abbia, e posto al foco sia,  
Poi che per gran calor quell' aria molle  
Resta consunta ch' in mezzo l'empia,  
Dentro risuona, e con strepito bolle  
Tanto che quel furor trovi la via;  
Così murmura e stride e si corruecia  
Quel mirto offeso, e alfine apre la buccia.  
vi, 27.

Già in ogni parte gli animanti lassi  
Davan riposo ai travagliati spirti.  
viii, 79.

\*Since writing the above I have read an article in the *Edin-burg Review* for April 1895, on "Dante's Classical Studies," in which almost the same language is used in regard to what

naturally under his pen as he wrote.\* This is true of such words as *scoccar*, *adocchiar*, *piover*, *intronò*, which have the genuine Dantesque ring. The following passages, then, are simply meant to illustrate this unconscious (or at most only half-conscious) verbal imitation. I have omitted a number of passages which seemed to be doubtful, and give only those which show a striking resemblance to Dante.

*Divina Commedia.*

Vassi in Sanleo. . . .  
.....  
Con esso i piè: ma qui convien ch' uom voli.  
*Purg.* iv, 26-28.

E caddi come corpo morto cade.  
*Inf.* v, 142.

Mi ritrovai per una selva oscura.  
*Inf.* i, 2.

Sovra 'l bel fiume d'Arno alla gran villa.  
(Florence on Arno) *Inf.* xxiii, 95.

See parallel passage to O.F. ii, 44.

Discende lasso. . . . .  
Per cento ruote.  
*Inf.* xvii, 131.

Questi, che mai da me non fia diviso.  
*Inf.* v, 135.

Amor, ch' a null' amato amar perdona,  
Mi prese del costui piacer sì forte,  
Che, come vedi, ancor non m'abbanda.  
*Inf.* v, 103-105.

Come d'un tizzo verde, ch' arso sia  
Dall' un de' capi, che dall' altro geme,  
E cigola per vento che va via;  
Così di quella scheggia usciva insieme  
Parole e sangue.  
*Inf.* xiii, 40-44.

Lo giorno se n'andava, e l'aer bruno  
Toglieva gli animai, che sono in terra  
Dalle fatiche loro.

the author calls Dante's "allusive references to earlier writers" and to "what we may perhaps venture to call the 'echo' of a quotation."



Io credea e credo, e creder credo il vero.  
ix, 23.

Se per amar l'uom debb' essere amato.  
xiv, 58.

Che pareo Gabriel che dicesse: Ave.  
*Ibid.*, 87.

Gigli spargendo va, rose e viole.  
xv, 57.  
(see also xliv, 32 and xlv, 85).

E con quell' oh, che d'allegrezza dire  
Si suole, incominciò, ma poi cangiosse  
xviii, 78.

Un destrier leardo,  
Tutto sparso di macchie e di rotelle.  
xix, 79.

Come il mastin che con furor s'avventa  
Addosso al ladro, ad acchetarsi è presto,  
Che quello o pane o cacio gli appresenta.  
xx, 139.

E l'abbracciare ove il maggior s'abbraccia.  
xxiv, 19.

Tra il sì Zerbino e il no resta confusa.  
*Ibid.*, 34.

Par che dinanzi a questa bestia orrenda  
Cada ogni muro, ogni riparo che tocca.  
xxvi, 33.

Porta l'augel che sopra gli altri regna.  
*Ibid.*, 98.

Gli è teco cortesia l'esser villano.  
xxvii, 77.

Come l'infermo che, diretto e stanco  
Di febbre ardente, va cangiando lato.  
xxviii, 90.

Quel monte,  
Per cui dal Franco è il Terracon distinto.  
xxix, 51.

Non, per andar, di ragionare lasciando,  
Non di seguir, per ragionar, lor via.  
xxx, 34.

*Inf.* ii, 1-3.  
I'credo ch'ei credette ch'io credesse.  
*Inf.* xiii, 25.

See parallel passage to O. F. v, 8.

Giurato si saria ch'ei (Gabriel) dicesse Ave.  
*Purg.* x, 40.

E, fior gittando di sopra e d'intorno.  
*Purg.* xxx, 20.

Mutâr lor canto in un O lungo e roco.  
*Purg.* v, 27.

Lo dosso e'l petto ed ambedue le coste  
Dipinte avea di nodi e di rotelle  
*Inf.* xvii, 14-15.

Quale quel cane, ch'abbaiando agugna,  
E si racqueta poi che'l pasto morde.  
*Inf.* vi, 28-29.

Also,—  
Con quel furore e con quella tempesta  
Ch'escono i cani addosso al poverello.  
*Inf.* xxi, 67-68.

Ed abbracciollo ove 'l minor s'appiglia.  
*Purg.* vii, 15.

Chè 'l sì e'l no nel capo mi tenziona.  
*Inf.* viii, 111.

Also,—  
Ed al sì ed al no, che tu non vedi,  
*Par.* xiii, 114.

Ecco la fiera, . . .  
Che passa monti, e rompe muri ed armi.  
*Inf.* xvii, 1-2.

Che sovra gli altri, com'aquila, vola.  
*Inf.* iv, 96.

E cortesia fu lui esser villano,  
*Inf.* xxxiii, 150.

Somigliante a quella inferma,  
Che non può trovar posa in su le piume,  
Ma con dar volta suo dolore scherma.  
*Purg.* vi, 149-151.

Al monte  
Per che i Pisan veder Lucca non ponno.  
*Inf.* xxxiii, 30.

Ne'l dir l'andar, nè l'andar lui più lento  
Facea.  
*Purg.* xxiv, 1.

Al maggior lampo (=the Sun).

*Ibid.* 50.

Quelle Furie crinite di serpenti.

xxxii, 17.

Come nave. . . . .

. . . . .

Va di nocchiero e di governo priva.

*Ibid.* 62.

L'ale avea grandi, che pareva due vele.

xxxiii, 84.

E di tutti faceva una mistura

Che di soavità l'alma notriva

xxxiv, 51.

Altro non bramo, e d'altro non mi cale.

xxxv, 76.

Di cortesia, di gentilezza esempj

Fra gli antiqui guerrier si veder molti,

E pochi fra i moderni.

xxxvi, 2.

Come ai meridional tiepidi venti,

Che spirano dal mare il fiato caldo

Le nievi si disciolveno e i torrenti,

E il ghiaccio che pur dianzi era sì saldo.

*Ibid.* 40.

(see also xxxi, 48).

Poichè molte, lasciando l'ago e'l panno.

xxxvii, 14.

Col dolce stil di che il miglior non odo.

*Ibid.* 16.

Vittoria è'l nome; e ben conviensi a nata

Fra le vittorie

*Ibid.* 18.

Alzando con viso giocondo,

I turbidi occhi alle Superne parti.

*Ibid.* 73.

Il fio pagar non tocche.

xxxix, 74.

E fuor del capo fe con larga vena

Correr di sangue un fiume in su'l arena.

xli, 101.

Ove 'l Isauero,

Lo ministro maggior

*Par.* x, 28.

Serpentelli e ceraste avean per crine.

*Inf.* ix, 41.

Ahi serva Italia. . . .

Nave senza nocchiero in gran tempesta.

*Purg.* vi, 76-77.

Duo grand' ali

. . . . .

Vele di mar non vid'io mai cotali.

*Inf.* xxxiv, 46-48.

Ma di soavità di mille odori

Vi faceva un incognito indistinto.

*Purg.* vii, 80-81.

D'altro non calme.

*Purg.* viii, 12.

Solea valore e cortesia trovarsi, etc.

*Purg.* xvi, 116 ff.

Si come neve. . . . .

. . . . .

Poi liquefatta in sè stessa trapela,

Pur che la terra, che perde ombra, spiri.

*Purg.* xxx, 85-89.

Also,—

Così la neve al Sol si disigilla.

*Par.* xxxiii, 64.

Le triste che lasciaron l'ago,

La spola e'l fuso.

*Inf.* xx, 121.

Di qua dal dolce stil nuovo ch'i'odo.

*Purg.* xxiv, 57.

(cf. also *Inf.* i, 87).

Savia non fui, avvegna che Sapia

Fossi chiamata.

*Purg.* xiii, 109-110.

Avendo gli occhi alle superne rote.

*Purg.* viii, 18.

'l fosso, in che si paga il fio,

*Inf.* xxvii, 135.

(cf. also *Purg.* xi, 88).

E li vid'io

Delle mie vene farsi in terra laco.

*Purg.* v, 84.

Dove l'acqua di Tevere s'insala.

Le sue dolci acque insala in maggior vase.  
xlii, 89.

Come accade ch'un pensiero  
Un altro dietro, e quello un altro mena.  
xlili, 64.

Non potria quant' oro  
È sotto il Sol pagare.

*Ibid.*, 138.

O terra, acciò ti si gittasse dentro,  
Perchè allor non t'apristi insino al centro?  
*Ibid.*, 140.

O me Fortuna in alto o in basso ruota.  
xli, 61.

*Purg.* ii, 101.

Nuovo pensier dentro da me si mise ;  
Dal qual più altri nacquero e diversi.  
*Purg.* xviii, 141-142.

(Cf. also *Inf.* xxiii, 10).

Che tutto l'oro, ch' è sotto la luna.  
*Inf.* vii, 64.

Ah! dura terra, perchè non t'apristi?  
*Inf.* xxxiii, 66.

Ch'alla Fortuna, come vuol, son presto.  
*Inf.* xv, 93.

and,  
Però giri Fortuna la sua ruota.  
*Ibid.*, 95.

L. OSCAR KUHN.

Wesleyan University.

#### APPARENT ABSENCE OF UMLAUT IN O.E.

Two cases are considered here :

1. The absence of the umlaut in appearance only, and
2. The real absence where it would be expected.

1. This is found in W.S. in certain forms in which the other dialects show umlaut : *ðréan*, *ðréagean*; *sméan*, *sméagean*; *fréa*; *éowan*.

The original of the last word we omit for the present. The others go back to *\*praujan*, *\*smaujan*, *\*frauja*. We have no reason to suppose that the *j* could have disappeared before causing umlaut. The evidence points the other way. Of *jo*-stems we have: *hieg* < stem *\*hauja*-; *hiew* < stem *\*hiuja*-; *glig* < stem *\*gliuja*-. Of *jā*-stems occur *ieg* (O.N. *ey*) < stem *\*aujō* < *\*a(g)ujō*; *ewe*, *éowe* < stem *\*aujō*. The form *ewe* could not come from an oblique case in which the *j* appeared, but would originate in a nom. *\*awi*, and the form so made would be generalized. Phonetically there ought to be nom. *ewe*, gen *\*iege*, etc. From *ewe* develops further the form *éowe*, (*éow* < *ew* < *ew*, cf. Sievers, *Ag. Gr.* §73, Anm. 1). From the adj. stem *\*niuja*- (Goth *niujis*) comes *niewe*. In the adj. forms *friges*, *frigum*, etc., by the side of a nom. *frío*, we have no case of

umlaut, since the root-syllable did not contain a vowel capable of umlaut. They are certainly not uncontracted forms, as set down by Sievers, *Ag. Gr.* §297, Anm. 2. The explanation is that we have a double leveling, the forms in *-io* coming from cases with *-ija* (as in Goth. *frijana*), while those with *-ig-* (= *ij*) come from cases with *iji*. The *g* here is a secondary development. For example, we may suppose the following development for the gen.: *\*fri(j)is* > *\*fri-s* > *\*fri-es* > *friges*.

The development of the corresponding verb is similar: *frijōn* > *\*fréon* > *fréog(e)an*. And so too: *fijan* > *\*fēon* > *fēogan*. Compare the old pres. parts. of these verbs, *fréond*, *fēond*. The long *i* of *Ps. frigan* is, of course, not an umlaut, but arose as in *friges*.

From the above it is evident that a *j* following a diphthong did not disappear without causing umlaut. For the W.S. *ðréan* and *sméan* (for which also the longer forms *ðréagean* and *sméagean*, developed as in *fréog(e)an* and *sméog(e)an*) occur *Ps. ðrégan*, North. *ðreiga*, *Ps. smégan*. The *é*, *ei* here must be the umlaut of *éa*, and not "the regular dialectic representative of *éa* before *g*" (Marguerite Sweet, *Am. Jour. Phil.* xiv, 428). This is apparent from the correspondence of vowels seen in W.S. *ciegan*, *cigan*, *Ps. cēgan*, North. *ceiga*, *ceia* from *\*kaujan*. Other non-W.S. verbs show-



ing the same umlaut are: *hēgan* (O.N. *heyia*) <\**haujan*, and *strēgan*, Goth. *straujan*, pret. *strawida*. The W.S. gave up its corresponding \**strīegan*, and leveled the verb to its pret. *strewede*. Therefore the *ēa* of *ðrēan*, *smēan* must be the contraction of the umlauted vowel with the suffix vowel. That is: *ðrēan* <\**ðrīe(j)an*; *smēan* <\**smīe(j)an*, just as *hēan* <\**hīe-han* > \**hauhjan*. Sievers, §408,4.

Similarly *frēa* <\**frīe(j)a* (cf. *frīgea*). By the side of *īewan*, *ȳwan* occurs in W.S. *ēowan*, which according to Sievers, §408,2 is not umlauted. This word is the same as Goth. *augjan*, O.H.G. *ougen*, M.H.G. (*z*-)*ougen*, *z-ounen*, etc., and is further related to Goth. *agō*, etc., O.H.G. *awi-zoraht ouga-zoraht*.

The diphthong *ēo* in *ēowan* cannot possibly go back to a Germ. *au(g)u-*, whether umlauted or not, but it can originate in *a(g)u-*, as Paul, *Beiträge* vi, 97, points out. Now since post consonantal *u* dropped before *īō* (Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii, §110) the original form of our verb was \**agjan*, pret. \**auīda*. By leveling and contamination of *ag-* and *au-* arose Goth. *augjan*, *augida*. But in O.E. the other development was generalized, giving \**aujan* (or perhaps rather *auwjan*, Kögel, *Beiträge*, ix, 526) pret. \**awida*. From these developed *īewan*, \**ewede* > *ēow(o)de*, with the spreading of both forms. With *au-* <*a(g)u-* (not *au(g)u-*) are formed O.H.G. *awi-zoraht*, M.H.G. *z-ounen*, M. L. Franc. *t-ōnen*, etc. On the confusion of *ag-* and *au-* cf. Osthoff, *Beiträge*, viii, 261, ff; Brugmann, *Grundr.* i, §444, Anm. 3; Franck, *Et. Wrdb.* sub *oog* and *toonēn*. The *ēa* of the dialectic *ēawan* is probably for *ēo*. From this standpoint, therefore, there is no difficulty in deriving these words from the I.E. *√ oq-* in Gk. *ὄψ*, *ὄσσε*, Lat. *oculus*, etc.

There is probably a similar contamination in *ēagor*, "sea, eagre," either for an original \**agor* or \**ægor*, cf. O.N. *Æger* <\**āgia-*. The influencing word was doubtless *ēa*, so that the change was comparatively late.

2. Here belong: *blāwan*, *clāwan*, *cnāwan*, *crāwan*, *māwan*, *sāwan*, *ðrāwan*, *wāwan*; *blōwan*, *flōwan*, *grōwan*, *hlōwan*, *rōwan*, *spōwan*.

In O.E. these verbs belong to the so-called reduplicating verbs. Similarly conjugated are Goth. *saian*, *waian*; O.N. *sá*; a few forms of

O.H.G. *blāan*, and of O.S. *sāian*, *thrāan*, *biknēgan*. Otherwise these verbs have become weak in these dialects. The reason for this is not far to seek. The most of them go back to presents formed from the root +*ē*+*īo-*, and +*ō*+*īo* (or *ā*+*īo*). Cf. Brugmann, ii, §739. Falling together in form with the causatives and denominatives, they became weak like so many other *īo-* presents.

But in O.E. there is no trace of a *j*. How is this to be explained? Sievers, §62, assumes that the *āw* in O.E. *blāwan*, etc., comes from *aiw*, comparing Goth. *saian*, *waian*, and the development seen in Goth. *snaiws*, *aiw*: O.E. *snāw*, *d*. But the two cases are not parallel. In *saiws* the *ai* is a real diphthong, but in *saian* the *ai* represents I.E. *ē*. Cf. Bremer, *Beiträge*, xi, 51 ff. In O.H.G. the development was *blāu* <\**blāju* < *blāīō* < *bhl-ē-īō*; and similarly *bluoīu* < *bhl-ō-īō*. This ought to give in O.E. \**blāwe* and \**blēwe*. The *w* is merely a transition-sound, and could not have developed while a *j* stood between the vowels. But it has already been shown that *j* standing between vowels does not disappear without causing umlaut. Nor can we assume a contraction *ē*+*ī* > *ā*; *ō*+*ī* > *ō*. Hence the only explanation possible is to adopt that given by Bremer, *Beiträge*, xi, 73, for Goth. *saia* <\**sēō* <\**sēmi*. Cf. also Möller, *Anz. f. d. A.* xx, 119.

These verbs, then, like the dissyllabic verbs of the same class had the athematic and the *īo-* inflection side by side. In O.E. the *īo-* inflection was crowded out, unless we except *sēwan*, which may be an umlauted form. Without *īo-* inflection are also O.N. *sá*, *klá*, (but also *klēia*) *gróa*, *róa*. In O.H.G. all these verbs eventually generalized the *īo-* inflection.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

University of Chicago.

#### THE POSITION OF THE SECONDARY ACCENT IN FRENCH ETYMONS having more than the two Pretonic Syllables.

##### I.

IN 1876,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Darmesteter announced his solution of the treatment in French of the pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Romania* v., pp. 141-164. Reprinted in *Reliques Scientifiques* ii, pp. 95-119. Paris 1890.

tonic syllable, a solution which has been regarded ever since as the standard explanation of this difficult question. His conclusions, known as "Darmesteter's Law" and having reference to the protonic syllable when not initial, and not followed by two consonants constituting checked position, were as follows: The tonic accent divides the word into two halves, and the final vowels of these two halves are subject to laws of like nature. These laws for the protonic are:

1. *a* remains usually as *e*; this *e*, when after a liquid or a vowel, generally falls at a later period:
2. All other vowels fall, or, if a supporting vowel is needed, become *e*. Certain groups of consonants not requiring a supporting vowel when final, do require it when protonic, on account of the additional influence of the sounds which follow. The examples given of such groups are: *nt-gr*,<sup>3</sup> *r-gr*,<sup>3</sup> *nc-t*,<sup>4</sup> *tr-c*,<sup>5</sup> *st-t*,<sup>5</sup> *tr-t*.<sup>5</sup> *v-r*, *v-l* have a tendency to require a supporting vowel:<sup>6</sup>
3. If the protonic vowel is in hiatus with the tonic, the preceding vowel is the true protonic; its treatment, however, varies in some respects from that of an ordinary protonic.<sup>7</sup>

The reason given for this law of protonics is that on four-syllable words there is a secondary accent upon the first syllable; that the word is then considered as being made up of two parts, and the last syllable of each part is influenced in the same way by the accent which precedes it.

It is to be noted that the law as expressed does not include the cases where there are more than two pretonic syllables. What is the position of the secondary accent in these words, and its effect on the adjacent syllables?

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Darmesteter uses the terms *pretonic* and *protonic* in different senses. The protonic syllable is that pretonic syllable which directly precedes the tonic. This useful distinction in nomenclature seems to have been neglected by other writers with the exception of Prof. Meyer-Lübke. Cf. his *Grammaire des Lang. Rom.* i, p. 290. §341.

<sup>3</sup> Darmesteter, *Rom.* v., p. 147.

<sup>4</sup> Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 149.

<sup>5</sup> Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 156.

<sup>6</sup> Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 148.

<sup>7</sup> Darmes., *l. c.*, pp. 162-163.

On this point we have a diversity of views limited, apparently, only by the number of Old-French grammars which have appeared, and of plausible theories which can be suggested. The following are the theories:

1. Darmesteter, in the article already referred to,<sup>8</sup> expresses himself as in doubt concerning the position of the secondary accent. In his grammar,<sup>9</sup> however, which appeared fifteen years later, he states that, beginning at the tonic accent and moving back, each second syllable receives a secondary accent.
2. Meyer-Lübke<sup>10</sup> is of the opinion that the secondary accent is initial.
3. Schwan<sup>11</sup> holds that the secondary accent is on the second pretonic syllable when this is long by nature or position, otherwise on the third. A mute and a following liquid are counted as making a vowel position-long. *Composita*, when felt as such, are not accented on the first element.<sup>12</sup>
4. Suchier, in *Le Français et le Provençal*<sup>13</sup> passes over the question altogether.

Thus we have complete disagreement, yet no one of the writers mentioned has given reasons for his conclusions. The chronological order in which these views appeared is:

Initial accent, 1890 (Meyer-Lübke);

Binary accent, 1891 (Darmesteter);<sup>14</sup>

Same system as that of the Classic Latin for main accent, 1888 (Schwan);

Reaffirmed in his new edition, 1893.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 164, note 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Grammaire Historique* i, §41.

<sup>10</sup> *Gr. des. Lang. Rom.* i, §341, and *Zeit. f. Fr. Sp. und Lit.* xv (1893), p. 88.

<sup>11</sup> *Altfranz. Gram.*, First edition (1888), §47; second edition (1893), §53.

<sup>12</sup> The statement of his theory for the position of the secondary accent is the same in both editions, save that in the second he leaves out the explicit statement made in the first that hiatus *i, e* count as a syllable in determining the place of the accent. That he still holds this view, however, is shown by his marking the secondary accent in one such word, *Comparatione*.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. §10.

<sup>14</sup> This, of course, does not count as a later view than the preceding, since Prof. Darmesteter died in 1888.

<sup>15</sup> Still a fourth theory might be suggested, though, so far as I know, no effort has been made to explain the French forms solely by it; it might be said that the secondary accent arose altogether from analogy, and that, for example, *nidificare* had an accent on the first syllable because of *nidus*.



Since there is such a conflict in the views of scholars touching this subject, and yet the arguments on which they based these views are wanting, I deemed it worth while to seek the solution, even though results, if any should be attained, would probably only corroborate some view already announced. I, therefore, collected all French words I could find with etymons having three or more pretonic syllables,<sup>16</sup> my main source being Gustav Körting's *Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch*. This list is probably about complete, with the exception of proper names, which Körting does not give.

After we exclude learned or loan words from the collection thus made, not all the rest are available as the foundation of an argument on the nature of their etymons, since simpler forms occur for a large number, built on the same root, and with an exactly corresponding stem in the French. Here the probability of influence exercised is so great that such words are absolutely worthless as testimony upon the nature of the forms from which they are derived. From the group which remains—the only competent witnesses in the case—I believe we can draw a satisfactory conclusion, as follows :

The secondary accent is initial save in words easily recognized as composita; there it is on the first syllable of the second element.

If we accept this statement not only do the examples range themselves satisfactorily under it, but it is in harmony with the Latin background of the words. The fact of initial accent in the Old Latin is definitely established. Now, in a language with strong accentuation it is very probable, if not absolutely necessary, that long words have a minor accent in addition to the main stress. Prof. Lindsay in his

Such an explanation would be incomplete and unsatisfactory, for it would be necessary to find shorter forms, accented on the proper syllable, not alone for all words with more than two pretonic syllables, but also for the words covered by Darmesteter's Law. It is not, however, at all unreasonable to suppose that in some instances such simpler Latin forms may have had influence, though I have not found it necessary to make this assumption in any case.

<sup>16</sup> In the appendix I add all the words not discussed in the body of the paper, with the exception of words that are clearly loan or learned forms.

new work, the *Latin Language*,<sup>17</sup> suggests<sup>18</sup> that while the main accent was still initial, there must have already been a secondary accent on the penult or antepenult, and that the later accent was a mere change of the relative strength of the two accents. According to this view the initial secondary accent existed in the Classic Latin. We have nothing to disprove this; on the other hand, if it be shown that the Saturnian verse is accentual and not quantitative—a point still in dispute<sup>19</sup>—the presence of the secondary accent will be proved for the period in which it was written. However this may turn out, it is an argument in favor of the initial position of the secondary accent that it corresponds to the Old-Latin accentuation.<sup>20</sup>

The fact of Folk-Latin recomposition is well known; for *displacet* we have *displâcet*, for *reddidit*, *reddêdit*, etc., with the original vowel retained and the accent on the second member of the compositum. Along with the tendency for the tonic accent to leave the first member, a similar tendency would naturally exist for the secondary accent. Thus the Latin accentuation is favorable to both points of the system of accent proposed.

In entering upon an examination of the subject before us, I had no bias toward any one of the theories given, or toward any theory, yet since Prof. Darmesteter's main conclusions in his article on the protonic in French are so clearly correct, I followed the plan of investigation that his line of reasoning suggested. If, as he puts it,<sup>21</sup> the tonic accent divides a word into two halves, and the final syllables of these halves undergo similar

<sup>17</sup> *The Latin Language; an historical account of Latin Sounds, Stems, and Flexions*, by Wm. Lindsay, M. A., Oxford, 1894.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.

<sup>19</sup> Lindsay, *l. c.* p. 159, and *American Journal of Phil.*, 1893, pp. 139-170.

<sup>20</sup> The doubling of a consonant, originally single, occurs, for the Italian, in a majority of cases after the accented syllable. In a number of cases this doubling also takes place after the first vowel of a long word; for example, *accademia*, *camminare*, etc. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gram.*, p. 154, §267; D'Ovidio, *Romania* vii, pp. 199-211; and Schuchardt, *Romania* vii, pp. 104-105. This may indicate the persistence of an initial secondary accentuation in Italian territory.

<sup>21</sup> *l. c.*, pp. 163-164.



changes, due to their corresponding relations to the two accents, then in words with three pretonic syllables, in case accent is initial, we should surely look for an absolute reduction of the intermediate syllable corresponding to the universal fall (for French) of unaccented penults. Certainly the influence of the secondary accent would not be transferred with almost annihilating force to the last syllable of its group and yet fail to affect the intermediate syllable. If, on the other hand, the accent is binary and the secondary accent falls on the second syllable, then this second syllable should maintain itself absolutely.

I applied this system of reasoning to the words I had collected, but the results were not conclusive. Some cases contradicted an absolute fall of the second pretonic syllable; for example, \**crudalitem* > *cruauté*, \**ministerarium* > *menestrier*, \**ligamenarium* > *liemier*, etc.<sup>22</sup> Certain cases, on the other hand, indicated a weakening of the syllable in question; as, \**arboriscellum* > *arbroissel*, \**nidificare* > *nicher*, etc.

Schwan's theory proved much more pliable; for working proposes as a practical test it seemed to meet our wants, but a difficulty arises here from the small number of the words at our command. The theory occupies a middle ground, accenting in some cases one, in certain cases the other of the syllables in dispute, and thus reducing by one half the number of words available as testimony in favor of either of the other theories as opposed to it. Looking at Schwan's view from the positive side, the testimony in favor of it is similarly halved, and a few coincidences<sup>23</sup> could explain away the little existing positive evidence in favor of the system of accentuation. Had this theory been intrinsically probable, I might have accepted it and called for proof that the agreement is mere coincidence, but a theory that counts a mute plus a liquid as making the preceding vowel long; that treats a single word exactly as if it were two independent words; and that, in addition, is the most cumbersome of the views proposed,

<sup>22</sup> The whole list of examples will be considered in full further on.

<sup>23</sup> How such coincidence could arise will be shown below, col. 375, line 14, ss.

cannot be accepted absolutely on the strength of only a half dozen words.

Thus my results were unsatisfactory. I had either to give up the problem or to find a better point of view from which to consider it. I returned to my point of departure, Darmesteter's Law. This law is undoubtedly true; but why is it that the fall of this protonic vowel occurs? The reason assigned is, that after the word is divided into two parts, the protonic is then a final<sup>24</sup> and is treated as such, falling after the preceding accent. This is an arbitrary assumption. The protonic syllable is not really a final syllable, and while it stands in the same relation to the secondary accent as the final syllable to the tonic accent, is it not after all a mistake to treat it as if final; for when the tonic accent has such a powerful influence over the syllables which follow it, practically reducing them to nothing, why should it not exercise some influence over the preceding syllable? We find actual cases within the Romance field where protonic vowels disappear before the accent even when initial. Instances occur in the Piedmontese dialect: for example, *tle=telajo*, *dne=danajo*, *vzin=vecino*; and in the Emilian also: *klomb=colombo*, *dmeng=domenica*, *tsved<dissipatus*, etc.<sup>25</sup> It is perfectly natural, however, that the influence of the accent should be greater and extend farther over what follows than over what precedes it, since its influence over preceding syllables is anticipatory. Where the preceding syllable is the initial syllable of the word, this would tend to prevent its being slurred over or neglected. The great majority of words in which the protonic syllable is not initial have two pretonic syllables. In such words the protonic is directly between the tonic and the secondary accent. The fact of its being before the strong tonic accent must have had an effect at least as great as that caused by its being just after the weaker secondary accent. Thus, it is the conjoined effect of the two that causes the fall; not, as has been heretofore claimed, the influence of the secondary accent alone. When we have more

<sup>24</sup> Mr. Darmesteter in his *Grammaire Historique* calls the non-initial protonic syllable the "counter-final;" vol. i, p. 85, §48.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gr.*, §127.

than two pretonic syllables, the fall of the pretonic vowel is just as regular, while there is at least a tendency for the preceding syllable to remain. Granted the secondary accent is initial, this seems<sup>26</sup> to indicate that the stronger influence is that of the principal accent.

If then our reasoning is correct;

1. The secondary accent is initial, save in composita easily recognizable as such;
2. The pretonic vowel falls at least as much on account of its proximity to the tonic accent as because of its proximity to the secondary accent.

The second pretonic syllable, being next after the secondary accent, should probably show signs of weakening, but since it is separated from the tonic accent, it need have no such absolute tendency to fall as that which the pretonic exhibits. Since even the pretonic is preserved as *e* when surrounded by consonants demanding a supporting vowel, certainly as much should be expected of the second pretonic. This helps to explain the completeness with which Schwan's law seems to cover the examples, for when the second pretonic vowel is followed by two consonants, *e* is required as a supporting vowel. It so happens that in a majority of cases the original vowel is *e* or *ɪ*, and the supporting vowel seems to Schwan to be the original vowel retained because it is "long by position," and hence the accent rests upon it.

I have not spoken of the words which can only be considered as having three pretonic syllables, if we count a hiatus vowel as making a separate syllable. If we accept the theory of initial accentuation, the hiatus vowel in these words in no way affects, of course, the position of the secondary accent. It has, however, been long since definitely settled that in the development of French words this hiatus vowel does not count as a syllable. All these words, therefore, are excluded from our consideration.

In order to simplify my statement, I have heretofore deferred a general citation of words, so that they may all be considered together. From the list that follows I have excluded

<sup>26</sup> I thus limit my statement because the fall of the pretonic in such words might be explained by analogy to the far greater number of words with only two pretonic syllables.

learned or loan words, and compounds having in French a simpler form exactly corresponding to the original of compound;<sup>27</sup> for example, *remouliner*; cf. *moulin*. Excepting such words, the list contains all I have collected.

1. Words in which the second pretonic syllable does not disappear, and which, therefore, include all that might seem to favor binary accent.

\**Exaequaculare*—*égailier*, \**matricularium*—*marreglier*.

If we reject the anaptyctic *ɪ* in these words, the *a* and *i* are really the pretonic syllables in each case; and even apart from this, the *a*, being the vowel most capable of resistance, would be expected to remain as *a* or *e*, while the *tr* of the second word requires a supporting vowel.

\**Crudalitem*—*cruauté*, \**ligaminarium*—*liemier* (Old Fr.), *paraveredum*—*palafreid*<sup>28</sup> or *palefreid*.

The *a* in these words remains, as is to be expected. *Paraveredus* should perhaps be excluded, since the only two other cases of *fr* representing *vr* are initial, and this may indicate that the word developed in two parts. The form *palafreid*, however, would contradict this supposition.

\**Ministerialem*—*menestral*, \**ministerarium*—*menestrier*.

Here *n-st* requires the supporting *e*.

*Imp̃ratorem*—*empeor*.

Here is a word, and the only one, which seems to clash with our law. There would be no phonetic difficulties in \**empeor*. The word in its nominative form *imperator*, *emperere* troubled Mr. Darmesteter,<sup>29</sup> from its retention of the pretonic, the *e* in question. The explanation, however, is very simple. *Imperatorem* seemed to the popular mind—and probably correctly—as much a compound of *in* as, for example, *impedicare*, and so the accent was *imp̃dratorem*, and the *e* remained.

2. Words in which the second pretonic syllable is lost.

<sup>27</sup> For these, see the appendix.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Kürting, *Wörterbuch*, 5887.

<sup>29</sup> *l. c.*, p. 149: "*emperere* . . . est une véritable anomalie."



\*Dominicellum—dameisel.

This word must be excluded, since the Folk-Latin form was *domnus*, *i* falling between *m-n*; the compound would naturally be built on the popular form. This explains the presence of the *e* in *dameisel*, the *mn* requiring a supporting vowel.

Pütiditatem—puteé,<sup>30</sup> nitiditatem—neteeé,<sup>30</sup>  
\*arboriscellum—arbroissel, \*nīdicare—nicher,  
\*planiturosum—plantureux,<sup>31</sup> \*auctoricare—ot-  
teier.<sup>32</sup>

### 3. Words compounded with prepositions.

This list includes only those compounded forms which have not the simplex as an independent word in French. In every case the development indicates that the secondary accent was on the first syllable of the last member.

\*Allecticare—allecher, \*apprivitiare—apprivoiser, \*assēditare—assetter, \*attitulare(?)—atteler  
\*delābulare—délābrer, \*exfundulare—effondrer, \*expandicare—épancher, \*expūliciare—épucer, \*expāventare—épaventer, \*extrādicare—esraichier, impēdicare—empêcher, intaminare—entamer, \*imprūmutuare—emprunter, interrogare—enterver, recuperare—recouvrer, reprobicare—reprocher, ad mēnt(em) habere amentevor.<sup>33</sup>

### 4. Words conforming to the accent law but furnishing only negative evidence, since they are explicable by analogy:

\*Aureleanensis—Orlenois, (cf. Orléans), \*Vigilantivus—Veillantif, (cf. veiller), \*expūlūcare—éplucher (cf. expilūcat),<sup>34</sup> \*pedītīcūlare—pétillier (cf. peditīculat), \*movītīnare—mutiner<sup>35</sup> (cf. movitīnat), \*sollīcītare—soucier (cf. sollicitat), joculatorum—jogleor (cf. nom. joglere), predīcatorem—prêcheur (cf. prêcher), semīna-

<sup>30</sup> For the seeming exception to Darmesteter's Law, cf. Darmes., *l. c.*, p. 150.

<sup>31</sup> The *u* in this word presents a violation of Darmesteter's Law that indicates it is half-learned.

<sup>32</sup> This word seems to indicate that the second pretonic fell before the protonic. This last then remains as a supporting vowel. Mr. Darmesteter, *l. c.*, p. 153, explains the word from a third pers. sing. *auctorīcat*, but there is no sufficient reason for the accent in this form to rest on the penult.

<sup>33</sup> Cited because the parts do not develop as if they were separate words.

<sup>34</sup> Where the *i*, being pretonic, falls.

<sup>35</sup> For the *u*, cf. *mutin*.

torem—sèmeur (cf. semer), medicamentum,—megement, \*medicaticium, megeis, \*medicatissam,—megerisse (cf. meges).

### 5. Words that throw no light on the question, but offer no opposition to initial accentuation.

Cōnquīsitionem—cuiseçon, \*gravamentare—guermenter, \*invölūtūare—envelopper, oripēlargum—orpres, aedificare—aigier, fructīficare—frotigier, \*frigidulosum—frileux.

The last word, in spite of its irregularity, would point to initial accent were it not that we should write it \**frigidulosum* (cf. dominicellum, *supra*, col. 359, l. 1, and so it has only two pretonic syllables.

Our discussion thus far has included only words with three pretonic syllables. What of those that have more? I have found only five such words, and they are worthless as test words:

\*Apparicūlare—appareiller (cf. pareil), \*pediticūlare—pétiller (cf. 3rd person sing.), \*expediticūlare—épouiller (cf. 3rd person sing.), \*exaequacūlare—égailer (cf. 3rd person sing.), \*excollūbicare—escolorgier (cf. 3rd person sing.).

We have now completed the list of words that bear on the question and find that the law fits all cases arising under it. But, after all, its main feature, initial accent, was announced by Mr. Meyer-Lübke several years ago. Yet it is since then that Darmesteter's grammar, positing binary accent, appeared, and that Schwan, in the second edition of his grammar, reasserted his theory. In view of this, and especially as none of the evidence in the matter had been given, I have deemed this examination of the question justifiable. If it has confirmed one of the theories already announced, I am glad that such is the case rather than to add a new theory to the list already too large.

E. C. ARMSTRONG.

Johns Hopkins University.

## CONTEMPORARY FRENCH LITERATURE.

*Nouveaux essais de littérature contemporaine*, by GEORGES PELLISSIER. Paris: 1895. 18mo, 382 pp.



IN this second volume of essays Pellissier considers the work of Alfred de Vigny, the Younger Dumas, Taine, Zola, J. H. Rosny, Marcel Prévost, Abel Hermant, Paul Bourget, Paul Hervieu, Jules Lemaitre, Loti and Anatole France. The scope of his treatment varies from a discussion of the author as represented in his entire writings (de Vigny, Dumas, Rosny, Hermant, France) to the review of his latest productions (Zola, Prévost, Bourget). De Vigny, whom we did not expect to find among contemporary authors, appears here on account of his alleged relations to the symbolist school, while Taine receives a passing mention in connection with his standards of literary criticism.

Of the genuine contemporaries Rosny, who supports the plots of his books with erudition furnished by the natural sciences, Prévost, who attained temporary notoriety by his argument against the "Americanizing" of French manners, or morals (*Demi-Vierges*), Hermant, whilom disciple of Zola, now in revolt and a psychologist, or anatomist of the mental attributes of man; and Hervieu, whose sketches of fashionable society have extended his reputation beyond local limits, are still to be classed among the second or even third-rate writers, and as such possess few attractions for foreigners. France and Lemaitre may be more rightfully studied as critics; but it is in their capacity as novelists that they are reviewed here, Lemaitre in his story *les Rois*—partly "philosophical" and partly idyllic, and interesting principally for the way it reflects the personality of its author—France, under the plea he himself presents, that "criticism is a kind of novel-writing, since every novel is an autobiography." Pellissier's remarks on this eclectic wit ("delicious sophist" he terms him) are among the keenest and most judicious of the collection. They form also one of its longest chapters.

There remain, after these deductions, four authors, the most prominent, the most widely read at home and abroad, Dumas fils, Zola, Bourget and Loti. The first of these and the oldest in years, Dumas has recently published an essay on the status of the modern family, and this paper occasions Pellissier's study of Dumas' attitude towards the family in his dramas.

When Dumas first appealed to the suffrages of a Parisian audience, he had already made his choice of subject and decided on the tendency of his life-work. He had determined to bring before his nation in the most effective way, appealing both to the ear and eye, the unnatural pass to which the laws governing the relations of the family among its members had brought that nation, or rather the society of the nation. Since these laws deviated from the laws of nature, and were no longer based on the foundations of justice, he would devote all his energies to their modification, and to a warfare with the conventionalities which supported them. By obtaining their recasting, so that they should conform to the natural ties of man, he would thus redeem society and insure its perpetuity. Consequently, Dumas is not to be regarded as a revolutionary agitator, but as a prudent conservative. His first plays revealed his doctrine: Love which continued outside of wedlock was vain, contrary to the decrees of nature; nor could the courtesan, however deep her repentance and pure her affection, hope for an honorable union in this life, to the detriment of the family (*la Dame aux camélias*). The same reasoning under somewhat different circumstances—the woman being older, having been once married and seeking to fortify her new respectability with another marriage—obtains in *le Demi-Monde*.

Later, the other side of the question is brought forward, and the young girl who has erred through ignorance or deceit may redeem herself, and take her place among the matrons of the land (*les Idées de Mme Aubray, Denise*). Even the wife, who hides for the child's sake a sin antecedent to her marriage, may receive a full pardon from a just husband (*Monsieur Alphonse*). But the punishment of the adulterer of either sex is swift and sure (*la Femme de Claude, la Princesse Georges, l'Étrangère, Francillon*). Finally, the father's duty towards his illegitimate offspring is emphatically proclaimed (*le Fils naturel*).

Any one familiar with French social prejudices, with the laws governing the responsibilities of unmarried parents—where all the burdens are thrown upon the women—and with the traditions of the French drama (most

important of all in the present case), will understand what a task Dumas set for himself. Pellissier sees in this long struggle, lasting a whole generation, the desire of the dramatist to defend the interest of society:

"le seul intérêt qui le préoccupe, c'est l'intérêt supérieur de la société, et comme la société a pour base la famille, c'est au relèvement de l'esprit familial qu'il a partout et toujours travaillé" (p. 93).

But we are inclined to differ somewhat from our critic, and find back of this desire something more personal, more intimate. Dumas' own position as regards society, the mutual relations of his parents, the Bohemian circle outside of social barriers in which his youth was passed, the impression made upon his mind by the fate of Marie Duplessis (Marguerite Gautier), are not these the determining motives for his unremitting assaults on human conventionalities, where they had grown away from nature? Another man in the same situation would very likely have become an enemy of society. But Dumas is a logician above everything, and also an observer. He could, being comfortable in material things (for very few nihilists are financially at ease), separate himself from his theme. Thus enabled to see both sides of the question, he can argue patiently for the modification of social statutes and opinions. Therefore, he is not a destroyer of the present social status, but a reformer of it. That he now thinks the family in a disintegrating state, and looks forward to its ultimate blending with humanity may, perhaps, be placed to the credit of socialistic theories, though I rather suspect it is mainly due to the changes wrought in French society by the invasion of Anglo-Saxon conceptions of family relations.

Dumas defends society as he would have it. Zola is indifferent to it, posing neither as its detractor nor advocator, but as a delineator of its latter-day passions. Pellissier, in dealing with this writer, considers only *la Débacle* and *le Docteur Pascal*. But since the latter had been heralded by the novelist as the crowning volume of his work, and in fact closed the long series of the Rougon-Macquart, it may very well be taken as an epitome of the whole. Pellissier naturally looks upon it in this light,

and welcomes the opportunity of discussing Zola's proposition underlying the series: the influence of heredity on the different members of the same family group. It is now nearly a quarter of a century since Zola formulated this law for his work, and though the ideas on which it was based have become somewhat trite, have reached the state of accepted beliefs and are assigned to their place in the general mass of human conceptions, yet the Rougon-Macquart family has continued to develop almost wholly along these novel (to 1870) lines. To be sure, Pellissier finds little trouble in tracing the influence of other opinions on the leading one. From the position of a passionless positivist that death is the end of existence, Zola has advanced to the state of an inquirer into the meaning of life, looking beyond the fact, dwelling on the mystery. Pascal is at times a disciple of occultism even.

Still the typical positivist, personified by this uncertain physician, overcomes the mystic, typified by his ward, by initiating her into the details of her family history—a conversion not at all plausible to the reader. It seems rather like begging the entire question. And it is possible that Zola himself is conscious of of his sleight-of-hand victory, for in *le Docteur Pascal* he brings forward more definitely and persistently than ever before his theory of the good, the moral good, attained by the mere continuity of physical life. Can it be that the supreme good of the Rougon-Macquart series is life? Life not in its living, but in its transmission, the mere succession of generations, son following on father? This is the lesson of *le Docteur Pascal*. By the transmission of life, the most decided positivist is made comparatively immortal, coexistent with the earth and the animals it breeds. And in this creation of new lives, this propagation of the species, virtue and vice are reconciled.

My attention was first drawn to this new conception of the novelist's by the concluding chapters of *Germinal*. The hope which there appears, the hope of the ultimate triumph of the right, through the progression of humanity, stood out in distinct colors when contrasted to the moral that sin is death of *l'Assommoir* and *Nana*. After *Germinal* the original doc-



trine was taken up again by *la Terre* and *la Bête humaine*. With *l'Argent*, however, the dogma of worldly immortality reappears, is transmitted to *la Débacle* and applied to the regeneration of a people, and, finally, is expanded into a Zolaesque code of ethics in *le Docteur Pascal*. It is the great man of the family, who would naturally affirm most strongly the first idea of the series, that qualifies it and undermines it with this phantom of a continued life beyond the grave, but on the earth: an earthly life the result of earthly affection.

This position is not positivism, as we understand it, yet it cannot be considered as in itself alien to Zola's belief in heredity. His preface to *la Fortune des Rougon* dated July 1st, 1871 is his manifesto:

"Je veux expliquer comment une famille . . . se comporte dans une société en s'épanouissant . . . Je tâcherai de trouver et de suivre, en résolvant la double question des tempéraments et des milieux, le fil qui conduit mathématiquement d'un homme à un autre homme . . ."

The last creation is, however, to be an exception to the rule, and Pascal is to study his family traits, as though he were not of it. The source of Zola's inspiration is evident. He is a true disciple of Taine. He desired, like his master, to apply to man the undeviating rules of nature, "mathématiquement" as he says. And he adhered to this, in the main, most uncompromisingly. Even after *Germinal*, in *l'Œuvre*, where the opportunity to anticipate the leading principle of *le Docteur Pascal* presented itself, he resisted the temptation, and closed the volume with "allons travailler," as the panacea for right and wrong.

More recently he broadens his view. The legacy of life is essential to the fact of heredity. Therefore the transmission of life is the chief duty of man—provided he allows the desirability of continued human existence—and also the ethics of the Rougon-Macquart, just as the law of temperaments and environment was its psychology. The bearing of this doctrine on practical morality is direct, and the consequence somewhat startling. For it would place the vicious and the virtuous on the same plane, and would justify them both by their success in propagating their kind. Thus con-

duct and character are effectually removed from the field of moral science. Still, we must endeavor to read between the lines in this matter, and release our novelist from the strict application of his doctrine. For it is quite possible that he really intends to uphold the evolutionist theory of evil, and look for the gradual disappearance of wrong, worn away by the continuation of life through countless generations.

But, as the facts stand, Zola is guilty in his crowning volume of a persistent self-contradiction. He choses to consider men as animals merely—indeed the dumb beast is our elder brother—and allows no difference between man and the other forms of animal life. In other words, he neglects the peculiarities of the species, its sympathies, prejudices, manners, ideals. He sets his best man and best woman in the midst of an organized society, and makes them live like isolated savages on a desert island. They violate the principle of the family, as Dumas would claim, and in neglecting the formal observance of human customs (or the requirements of nature herself?) they are ostracised, ruined, starved out. And all this, not for the sake of principle, because they believe marriage is contrary to the interest of mankind, but from indolence, neglect, "innocence," perhaps Zola would say. It is this stripping man of the usual, ordinary attributes of the species that leads some to condemn Zola's whole program as the reverse of "natural" and "scientific." He takes a general law of nature, and applies it without reservations or modifications to the most exceptional, independent type known in nature. But is there anything in the world pure, unmodified? Light even comes to us through a medium.

From Zola to Bourget is not a long step. Both are naturalists, followers of Taine, positivists. Only Bourget is a mental naturalist usually, while Zola is generally a physical one. One of Bourget's recent books (*Cosmopolis*) rather approaches Zola's standpoint of view, and analyzes the influence of heredity on personages that are typical each of its nation. It is a refined, international *Pot Bouille*—with all deference to Bourget.

Still with the greater number of Bourget's



characters the study of individual emotions and experiences predominates. The dissection of the minds of his heroes and heroines is his chief occupation; and the motives which actuate them the object of his researches. In the earlier novels this was the end of the story. But the later ones are yielding to the new tendency of converting their sinners, and do not close until they are safely within the fold of the church. One of the books that Pellissier reviews (*Terre promise*) is slightly more complicated, and chooses for its plot one of Dumas' favorite problems—the claims of the natural child on its father.

The question, which naturally arises in regard to Bourget's new view, is how deep this religious sentiment goes, how fruitful from the spiritual standpoint are these conversions. All the evidence at hand would indicate a literary fad, rather than a heart-felt longing. The persual of Bourget's novels tends not to edification. He puts before us a picture of sin, analyzing the desires and thoughts of his characters, who are actuated mainly by sensual emotions. When these emotions are exhausted, when the sinners are thoroughly disillusioned with the world and bored with life, then the novelist varies their monotony by opening to them the portals of the church. That the sinners are comparatively youthful when converted is no merit at all, since they have lived fast and run through all the physical sensations possible.

Pellissier sees in this twofold direction of Bourget's more recent stories the working of a tender heart upon a scientific mind. Possibly there may also be in it the echo of the humanitarianism which was proclaimed by the Russian novelists, or even the inevitable reaction against the creeds of positivism and naturalism. And possibly also it may come from Bourget himself, and represent a genuine belief on his part in the efficacy of righteousness and faith. *Le Crime d'amour* proclaimed the redemption of sinners through pity, while *le Disciple* showed a convert by reason. It may be that a future volume (*Terre promise*) contains one original, unstained believer) will take up this question of man's relations to his fellowmen and his Creator, and by the process of analysis disclose to us the workings of a

pure and upright soul, bent on the evangelization of the family and society. A champion of the Church militant would not be an unwelcome character in a psychological novel.

Bourget is an observer, a student of man outside of himself. Loti is also an observer, but an observer who is mainly concerned with his own emotions. Like Bourget and Zola he is a naturalist in his methods. Unlike them he shares in the sentiments he portrays, lives the life of his characters, breathes into them, whatever their condition and station, his own aspirations and his own terrors. For Loti knows the meaning of terror—this is the theme of Pellissier's review—and that terror is the one ever present with humanity, the terror of death. It is, perhaps, this overwhelming sense of the transitoriness of all things which makes Loti the writer that he is, indeed makes him a writer at all, as Pellissier would claim. For besides his marvelous aptitude for reflecting the outside world, the lines and hues of nature and art, to a degree of accuracy which can hardly be surpassed by the devices of photographic art itself, he has the faculty of casting around these reproductions of facts a shade of melancholy, of retrospect and foreboding, which never fails to react on the pulse of his reader, however common and ordinary reason and science may deem the theme. I only wonder that Loti has not been enrolled by force among the symbolists, so great is the twofold impression of fact and yearning that his words create.

What is the burden of this sceptic's song? The truism that we die while living, that every fleeting moment bears something of ourselves away, and every departure of friend or acquaintance, every removal of abode, destroys a certain portion of our personality. This we all know and accept more or less consciously, looking forward to a life beyond, eternally complete. Not so with Loti. He knows, believes nothing beyond the grave. For him death is oblivion, the vital spirit a part of the ambient air into which it vanishes. From such a destiny he shrinks—for he is no stoic—with sickening dread. It would be less painful to him to allow a compromise, to favor the fancies of occultism or take refuge in the survival of the species, trusting to the laws of

heredity for some slight existence through the coming generations. But he rejects all these comforts. He refuses to believe what he cannot see. The passing moments, the seasons gliding by, the day life of summer insects, the longer existence of the larger animals, all remind him that his end comes soon (*le Livre de la Pitié et de la Mort*). For they all are a part of him through his contact with them.

To save what he can of himself from destruction (Pellissier's argument), Loti turns in desperation to literature. And what he consigns of himself to the more enduring substance of books he considers, at least for a time, as rescued from annihilation. Here is the key to Loti's writings. They are autobiographies, in fact if not in name, descriptions of the different phases of the author's career, the places he has visited, the people he has met, the joys and sorrows he has occasioned or shared. Even his dreams are not disregarded in this category of emotions. Through all the changes of such a varied existence, tinged all these pictures of phenomena and art, runs the stream of his great, absorbing pity, pity for the brute beasts which die under his eyes, pity for Sylvestre and Gaud and Aziyadé, pity for springtime and autumn, pity above all for himself. He pities humanity, he suffers at the thought of humanity's earthly goal, but he pities and suffers obstinately, refusing succor. He adheres to facts. He imparts to facts symbols for this life. He denies to them symbols for a life beyond. By this constancy to his belief in the annihilation of the soul, in the similarity of man and beast, Loti remains today almost the only prominent defender of positivism and naturalism in literature. Even Dumas, who in the successive plays of his theatre did not swerve from the formula he had adopted at the outset, has doubts of his future state, and admits, indeed hopes, that some day he may be restored to that father, from whom it has been his lasting regret that he was separated ("Épître" at the head of *les Trois Mousquetaires*).

It would be rather difficult to draw a general moral from this new collection of Pellissier's, or even to conjecture from a study of these four leading writers what tendencies are to characterize the literature of the immediate

future. They all belong to the past. Their inspiration came from that wave of scientific investigation and deduction which submerged Europe during the reign of the Third Napoleon. That wave—so much their writings and indecisions teach—has now spent its force. It will apparently bear no other author to honor and renown, and as yet it has had no follower. The fluctuations of the later writers, Rosny, Hermant, Lemaitre, France (to cite only from Pellissier), their seekings for something new, or their eclecticism and opportunism, amply prove that no new ideas have come to arouse the sleeping forces of literature. When the ideas do come there will be no seeking, no hesitations, no quackery. Fads will have had their day. And poets will sing, dramatists plan, novelists portray as the consensus of human opinion compels them.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

#### OLD FRENCH TEXTS.

*L'Espurgatoire Saint Patriz* of Marie de France. An Old-French Poem of the twelfth century, published with an Introduction and a Study of the language of the author. Dissertation presented to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, by THOMAS ATKINSON JENKINS. Philadelphia: Press of Alfred J. Ferris, 1894. 8vo, pp. vi, 151.

WITH comparative rapidity the little band of widely scattered students of Romance philology in America are coming to cherish a feeling of *esprit de corps*, are beginning to recognize that there exists in this country something of a fellowship of kindred minds into which may be welcomed with cordiality younger aspirants for the honors and (can we say?) emoluments of a department of University activity peculiarly remote from the practical applications of daily life. Into such a fellowship, by the present well-chosen, well-conceived, and well-executed piece of work, Dr. Jenkins (who will not resent being classed among the younger scholars, since his "Vita" informs us that he was born in 1868) has shown good and sufficient reason to be welcomed. Nor is the free-



masonry of such a recognition to be limited by local bounds, inasmuch as his dissertation has already received the credit of thoroughgoing and appreciative criticism abroad, at the hands of Dr. Warnke of Coburg, than whom no one perhaps more competent to treat the subject could have spoken (*Litteraturblatt*, March 1895, cols. 82-88). Indeed, Dr. Warnke's interest in the *Espurgatoire Seint Patriz* rests on no less solid a foundation than his intention to bring out an edition of it, for which he has already constituted the text. His review accordingly presents a detailed and judicious criticism of Dr. Jenkins's text. As it is difficult, however, to say the last word on details so numerous, I find that I have a small quota of criticisms or emendations to add to the careful list furnished by Dr. Warnke.

Absolute consistency in the application of any given principles of text constitution being not easily possible, it is not to be wondered at that Dr. Jenkins should have occasionally lapsed in this regard. Having set for himself, e.g., the purpose of restoring the older forms of declension wherever this can be done without violence to rime or rhythm, the editor has changed nom. pl. *plusurs* to *plusur* in ll. 83, 93, but not in ll. 62, 65, 69, 145, 169, etc.—On p. 36, l. 8, and again pp. 45, 46, we are told that *-out*, *-ouent* answer to *-abat*, *-abant*, and that *-oënt* occurs only once (1018), yet ll. 1213, 1214 we find *escríoënt*, *dolusoïent* changed to *escríoënt* *dolusoënt*, and l. 1271 *montoïent* to *muntoënt*. At l. 115 *pouent* becomes *poeënt*, at 2110 *poënt* becomes *pueënt*; l. 1139 *estot* appears as *estoët*, l. 1243 *estuet*.

By way of emendation, I should be tempted to read, ll. 309, 310, *Puis li dist qu'ilnec ert l'entree Del Purgatoire e [la] trouee*; ll. 865, 866, I should punctuate, *A la porte sein vus merruns*, *Uentrastes hors vus mettruns*, and so ll. 1371, 1372; l. 2006, *dele* comma; l. 2223, read *si li bailla* (= *si la li bailla*); l. 2287 read *i ai for jo ai* (MS. has *iai*). This emendation is so obvious that Warnke's *i a* is doubtless only a misprint. (Of Warnke's other emendations it may be said that they commend themselves, perhaps without exception.)—On p. 47, last line, the editor implies the correction of *obscur* to *obscur* in l. 676 (pointed out by

Warnke), and uses the form *obscur* to illustrate a point, but without noting the change in his *errata*.—On p. 48, § 9 the term 'gerundive' is used for 'gerund.' (In the French translation of vol. ii of Meyer-Lübke's *Grammatik* the word *gérondif* is used indifferently for 'gerund' and 'gerundive'.)

The printing of O. Fr. texts is not yet subject to fixed canons, yet *Romanz* (l. 3) with a capital, *gries*, *apres*, *chies*, *espes*, etc., without an accent, and the fem. past participles (*guardées*, *escunsées*, etc.) with accent, contravene prevailing usage.—On p. 50 it is stated that "*en* (in) loses its syllabic value after *e* (et)." This, however, hardly makes it desirable to *print en* for *e en*, as in l. 461 (and elsewhere as indicated) *En jeûnes*, *en oraisuns*; or if this device be resorted to, then the comma should at least be omitted.

Of traces of inexperience the work of Dr. Jenkins shows exceedingly few; yet to set up and defend the existence of a word (*reance*) unknown elsewhere in the literature and inadmissible here, while the MS. reading is perfectly simple and acceptable (*Que jetté fussent hors d'erance* l. 202), may well be laid to this charge. This is the noble boldness that yields later to a sage discretion. It here stands out in somewhat startling contrast to the uniformly careful, scholarly and promising qualities of this youthful, yet well equipped doctor of philosophy.

H. A. TODD.

Columbia College.

#### LES DÉCADENTS.

*À propos du livre de M. A. LEUNE, Difficult Modern French*, 8vo, pp. 164. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1894.

LE livre de M. Leune ne saurait porter un meilleur titre que celui qui lui a été donné par son auteur, et les professeurs en quête de Français difficile lui sauront un gré infini des peines qu'il a prises. On pourrait peut-être lui chercher querelle au sujet de la dernière phrase de sa très intéressante préface que quelques esprits grincheux ou obtus pourraient s'obstiner à trouver obscure ou trop quintessenciée; mais, ceux-là se peuvent négliger, et ceux-ci y trouveront l'occasion d'exer-



cer d'une façon plus particulièrement aiguë (suivant l'expression de l'auteur) leur faculté de compréhension. Les notes fournies par M. Leune sont généralement suffisantes et très claires. Le travail typographique est presque parfait; nous avons cependant relevé à la page 164 une faute qu'on ne rencontrera certainement plus dans la deuxième édition: "strophes consécutifs" pour "strophes consécutives."

Quoique M. Leune nous prie de

"ne voir dans ce travail ni la manifestation de théories littéraires quelconques . . . . . ni même une tentative de classement d'œuvres toutes célèbres,"

nous avons, à tort ou à raison, l'impression qu'il a (ce en quoi nous ne nous reconnaissons pas le droit de le blâmer) une faiblesse pour les "Décadents"—et, puisque l'occasion s'en présente, pourquoi ne pas dire un mot de ces nouveaux venus dans l'arène littéraire.

Cette école, qui s'appelle aussi "Symboliste" quand elle ne s'intitule pas "Instrumentiste" ou "Romane," se compose d'écrivains qui tantôt s'entre-déchirent, tantôt s'entre-flagornent, mais qui se reconnaissent tous à un trait commun: l'obscurité. Ce sont ce que M. Catulle Mendès appelle, non sans malice, des "auteurs difficiles."

"Cette obscurité," dit M. René Doumic, "vient de plusieurs causes, mais elle vient d'abord de ce que ces auteurs ne savent pas clairement ce qu'ils veulent dire; et elle vient ensuite de ce qu'ils ne savent pas leur langue. Ils se sont proposé de réformer notre versification ou tout au moins d'en modifier le mécanisme; et en cela ils n'ont point tort. Mais le principe d'où ils partent est un principe faux. Comme l'école de Gautier et celle des Parnassiens qui en est issue s'étaient proposé d'appliquer à la poésie les procédés des arts plastiques, ils essaient d'y introduire les procédés de la musique. Ils dépouillent les mots de leur sens et les vident de leur contenu intellectuel pour ne s'attacher qu'à la sonorité des syllabes. On ne gagne rien à vouloir ainsi transposer les modes d'expression de chaque art, et à leur demander des effets qu'il n'est pas de leur essence de produire."

Un opusculé "Traité du Verbe," avec "Avant-Diré" de M. Stéphane Mallarmé, nous apprend quelles sont les lois qui régissent ou doivent régir les écrivains de la nouvelle école. D'après cette brochure, la voyelle A est noire

et correspond à l'orgue qui exprime le doute et la monotonie; E est blanc et correspond à la harpe qui exprime la sérénité; I est bleu et correspond au violon qui exprime la passion, la prière; O est rouge et correspond à la trompette qui exprime la gloire, l'ovation; U est jaune et correspond à l'ingénuité, au sourire. Le malheur dans tout ceci, c'est que les décisions de l'auteur du "Traité du Verbe" étant purement arbitraires, il s'en est suivi que certains écrivains ont refusé d'adopter ses théories. C'est ainsi que M. Arthur Rimbaud prétend que la lettre U est verte. J'avoue pour ma part n'y voir aucun inconvénient et je tombe d'accord avec M. Jules Lemaitre quand il dit qu'il lui paraît également possible qu'elle soit: "bleue, blanche, violette et même couleur de hanneton ou de fraise écrasée." Que si nous suivons maintenant M. Mallarmé jusque dans ses œuvres pour voir comment le grand prêtre de cette nouvelle église s'y est pris pour mettre ses idées en pratique, nous en arrivons à conclure qu'il est impossible au commun des mortels (et je n'aurai pas la cruauté de le classer dans cette catégorie) de voir comment s'accordent la théorie et la pratique. La seule conclusion qui se présente à l'esprit c'est que cet auteur a écrit des choses auprès desquelles les hiéroglyphes qui se trouvent sur les pyramides d'Égypte sont aussi limpides que l'eau d'une pure fontaine. Dans le sonnet qui suit, M. Mallarmé, afin de rendre la "révolution littéraire" plus complète, a renoncé à la ponctuation.

M'introduire dans ton histoire  
C'est en héros effarouché  
S'il a du talent nu touché  
Quelque gazon de territoire  
A des glaciers attentatoire  
Je ne sais le naïf péché  
Que tu n'auras pas empêché  
De rire très haut sa victoire  
Dis si je ne suis pas joyeux  
Tonnerre et rubis aux moyeux  
De voir en l'air que ce feu troue  
Avec des royaumes épars  
Comme mourir pourpre la roue  
Du seul vespéral de mes chars.

Comprenez-vous? Moi, pas. Et ce qu'il y a d'amusant c'est que M. Mallarmé prétend

procéder d'Edgar A. Poe; mais il ne voit pas que la pensée du poète américain est toujours facile à saisir, tandis que la sienne . . . . . lisez plutôt "L'Après-midi d'un Faune."

Une des plus grandes difficultés qui se présentent à l'esprit du critique, c'est la classification de ces jeunes auteurs. Beaucoup d'entre eux qui s'étaient lancés dans la littérature sous la bannière de la nouvelle école ont renoncé au "Décadisme," à son débraillé, à ses pompes et à ses œuvres. Quelques-uns ont abandonné l'église pour fonder une chapelle, d'autres se sont ralliés au bon sens. Paul Verlaine, que les "Jeunes" prisaient tant, a montré dans "Sagesse" qu'il est fort capable d'écrire de bonne et saine poésie. Rien n'est aussi instructif que de comparer les "Poèmes Saturniens," les "Fêtes galantes" ou les "Romances sans paroles" avec ses plus récentes œuvres.

#### *Poèmes Saturniens.*

La lune plaquait ses teintes de zinc  
Par angles obtus;  
Des bouts de fumée en forme de cinq  
Sortaient drus et noirs des hauts toits pointus.  
Le ciel était gris. La bise pleurait  
Ainsi qu'un basson.  
Au loin un matou frileux et discret  
Miaulait d'étrange et grêle façon.  
Moi, j'allais rêvant du divin Platon  
Et de Phidias,  
Et de Salamine et de Marathon,  
Sous l'œil clignotant des bleus becs de gaz.

#### *Sagesse.*

L'Ame antique était rude et vaine  
Et ne voyait dans la douleur  
Que l'acuité de la peine  
Ou l'étonnement du malheur.  
L'art, sa figure la plus claire,  
Traduit ce double sentiment  
Par deux grands types de la Mère  
En proie au suprême tourment.  
C'est la vieille reine de Troie:  
Tous ses fils sont morts par le fer.  
Alors ce deuil brutal aboie  
Et glapit au bord de la mer.  
. . . . .  
Et c'est Niobé qui s'effare  
Et garde fixement des yeux

Sur les dalles de pierre rare  
Ses enfants tués par les dieux.  
. . . . .

La douleur chrétienne est immense,  
Elle, comme le cœur humain,  
Elle souffre, puis elle pense,  
Et calme poursuit son chemin.  
Elle est debout sur le Calvaire  
Pleine de larmes et sans cris.  
C'est également une mère,  
Mais quelle mère de quel fils!  
Elle participe au Supplice  
Qui sauve toute nation,  
Attendrissant le sacrifice  
Par sa vaste compassion.  
Et comme tous sont les fils d'elle,  
Sur le monde et sur sa langueur  
Toute la charité ruisselle  
Des sept blessures de son cœur.

Par les extraits ci-dessus on peut voir que dans les "Poèmes Saturniens" la pensée de M. Verlaine demeure presque insaisissable, que les figures qu'il y emploie sont fausses ou ampoulées et que si l'on cherche à les analyser on n'y trouve que contradictions et fausse recherche. Il n'en va pas de même dans "Sagesse." L'écrivain a ici obéi à son inspiration sans viser à la préciosité ou à "l'impressionnisme" et nous nous trouvons en présence d'une œuvre réellement belle. Il serait impossible dans un article aussi court que celui-ci de faire un examen complet de tous ceux qui ont été et sont restés "Décadents." Nous ne pouvons, par exemple, parler de Mœterlinck dont M. le docteur Max Nordau a dit, dans son livre intitulé *Dégénérescence* que "son dialogue donne un tableau clinique des plus fidèles d'un incurable crétinisme."

Il nous faudrait aussi parler de ceux, heureusement fort nombreux, que les "nouveaux" appellent des "lâcheurs" et des "Judas," parce qu'ils ont consenti à écrire en Français intelligible; l'espace ne nous le permet pas. Nourrissons-nous donc de l'espoir que le nombre de ces "traîtres" augmentera de jour en jour, que beaucoup de ces écrivains qui sont doués d'un véritable talent cesseront d'être, selon l'expression de Renan, "des enfants qui se sucent le pouce," et qu'ils reviendront aux



saines traditions de la langue. La littérature ésotérique peut être de mode chez les peuples où les écrivains passent leur temps à ne rien dire, ou à dire des riens; elle ne le sera jamais au pays de France, cette terre classique du bon sens et de la logique. Les bizarreries des "Décadents" ne sont du reste pas pour nous surprendre; les mêmes fautes, les mêmes absurdités se retrouvent au commencement du dix-septième siècle. Le mauvais goût triomphait alors, mais il n'a fait que préparer la voie à la plus forte littérature que le monde ait jamais connue. Les mots ne sont que les vêtements dont s'enveloppent les idées et, quoique disent ou fassent les "Symbolo-instrumento-romano-décadents," ils ne feront croire à personne que telle lettre est de telle couleur et représente tel instrument, tandis que telle autre nuance et tel autre son s'incarnent dans tel autre signe de l'alphabet. La vieille maxime, "ce qui n'est pas clair n'est pas français" reste et restera inébranlée et inébranlable. Sans nul doute la fin du dix-neuvième siècle verra la "banqueroute" des "Décadents."

On a cru intéressant de joindre à cet article une nomenclature des principaux auteurs décadents et de leurs œuvres:

STÉPHANE MALLARMÉ: "Vers et Prose;" "Villiers de l'Isle-Adam;" "Le Ten O'clock de M. Whistler;" "Vathek, de Beckford, avec Avant-Dire et Préface;" "La Musique et les Lettres" (1895).

PAUL VERLAINE: "Poèmes Saturniens," 3<sup>e</sup> édit.; "La Bonne Chanson," 2<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Fêtes Galantes," 3<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Romances Sans Paroles," 3<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Sagesse," 3<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Jadis et Naguère," 2<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Amour," 2<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Bonheur;" "Parallèlement," 2<sup>e</sup> édit.; "Chansons Pour Elle;" "Liturgies Intimes;" "Odes en Son Honneur;" "Élégies," "Dans les Limbes;" "Dédicaces;" "Epigrammes."

PROSE:—"Les Poètes Maudits;" "Louise Leclercq;" "Mémoires d'un Veuf;" "Mes Hôpitaux;" "Vingt-sept Biographies de poètes et littérateurs publiées dans les *Hommes d'aujourd'hui*;" "Mes Prisons;" "Quinze Jours en Hollande," avec portrait (tirage sur japon).

THÉÂTRE:—"Les Uns et les Autres," comédie en un acte, en vers.

JULES LAFARGUE: "Les Complaintes;"

"Imitation de Notre-Dame à la Lune;" "Moralités légendaires" (en prose).

ARTHUR RIMBAUD: "Les Illuminations," avec une préface de P. Verlaine.

JEAN MORÉAS: "Le Pèlerin passionné;" "Eriphyle;" "Cantilènes."

SÂR PÉLADAN: "Babylone."

BERNARD LAZARE: "Médaillons;" "Ceux d'aujourd'hui;" "Ceux de-Demain."

ANDRÉ GIDE: "Orgueil."

COMTE DE LAUTRÉAMONT: "Chants de Maldoror."

ERNEST RAYNAUD: "Les Cornes du Faune;" "Le Bocage."

FERNAND CLERGET: "Les Tourmentes."

JEAN JULLIEN: "La Vie sans lutte;" "L'échéance."

LAURENT TAILHADE: "Au pays du Mufle."

ADOLPHE RETTÉ: "Thulé des Brumes;"

"L'Archipel en fleurs."

PAUL VÉROLA: "Les Baisers morts;" "Horizons."

F. A. CAZALS: "Iconographie de Laurent Tailhade," etc.

Voici maintenant une liste presque complète des revues dans lesquelles paraissent la plupart des œuvres nouvelles des "Décadents:"

Le Mercure de France;

L'Ermitage;

La Plume (organe de P. Verlaine);

L'Art social;

L'Idée libre;

La Revue Blanche;

Les Écrits pour l'Art;

La jeune Belgique (Bruxelles, organe de Mœterlinck);

Le Réveil;

Les Mystiques;

L'Art littéraire;

Les Isolés;

Les Essais d'Art libre;

Il va sans dire que beaucoup de ces publications n'ont qu'une durée très éphémère, et au moment où j'écris il est fort possible que quelques-unes d'entre elles aient disparu. "La Plume" cependant, qui en est à sa septième année, semble devoir résister.

C. FONTAINE.

Central High School, Washington City.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

CHAUCER'S *House of Fame* AND BOC-  
CACCIO'S *Amorosa Visione*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In one of his helpful notes upon Chaucer (*Anglia*, xiv, p. 233), Koeppl remarks:—

"Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione* ist von den Chaucer-forschern bisher nicht beachtet worden. Der gelehrte autor hat in dieser dichtung seine belesenheit in so reizloser weise zur geltung gebracht, dass man sich nach den leidlichen ersten gesängen bald versucht fühlt, das buch welches deren fünfzig zählt, aus der hand zu legen."

Undoubtedly, if the poem is read continuously, this judgment seems justified. Yet here and there attractive bits of description and narration relieve the otherwise dreary and labored allegory, and we need not suppose Chaucer had recourse to the poem only with an eye to practical profit.

It was once suggested, of course absurdly, that Chaucer lacked the patience to read books through, and that what he borrowed is generally to be discovered in the first few pages of his originals. At first sight this might seem true in the present case—it might appear that for Chaucer as for Koeppl the poem was lacking in interest—for the parallel passages to the *Parlement of Foules* and the *House of Fame* which are instanced by Koeppl are all in the first six cantos. But Chaucer's indebtedness did not end here. Throughout in many ways (barring the element of humor which Chaucer loved at all times but which Boccaccio abstained from in his verse), the poets, to use an old phrase, "favor" one another,—moreover, there seems to be sufficient evidence of direct indebtedness to show that Chaucer used the remainder of the poem as well as the first six cantos.

Koeppl's parallels (reference is here made only to the *House of Fame*) identify in a very interesting way, the *Lady Fame* of Chaucer with Boccaccio's *Gloria del popol mondano* and show that both poems speak of Virgil, Lucan, Ovid, and Statius, and in much the same fashion. In conclusion Koeppl says:

"Das sind die fälle, welche mir dafür zu

sprechen scheinen dass Chaucer auch die 'Amorosa Visione' mit aufmerksamkeit gelesen hat. Stofflich berührt sich Boccaccio im weiteren verlauf seiner dichtung noch sehr häufig mit Chaucer, ohne dass wir jedoch, bei dem reichlichen fließen anderer quellen, anlass haben, in seinen versen Chaucer's vorbild zu suchen."

One of the features of similarity is the citation of stock examples in history and mythology of loving maidens left forlorn. These, with their stories told at various lengths, take up a good part of the *Visione*; in Chaucer they are used to illustrate the fact that Æneas was not alone in his "greet trespass," and all but two, (Demophon and Phillis, and Theseus and Adriane) are dismissed in a line or so. It is of course natural to refer such a list at once, as Skeat, for example, does (notes on ll. 388-426) to Ovid's *Heroides*, but in so doing, it is possible to be a bit hasty. If the reader is sufficiently interested to inquire why Chaucer gave twenty-one lines to the story of Theseus, Phedra and Ariadne, while dismissing the others so briefly; if, in consequence, he tries to divine the reason for Chaucer's special interest by comparing him with Ovid (*Ep. x*), it will be matter of surprise to find that Ovid does not mention Phedra at all either in the *Heroides*, or, what is more, in the *Metamorphoses*. The same difficulty holds with regard to the story as told again by Chaucer and so charmingly in the *Legend of Good Women*.

The question of Phedra's connection with the legend seems to be an obscure one, and need not be touched upon here; the chief point is where did Chaucer find his version of the story, as it is also of interest to inquire where he obtained such precise information with regard to Phillis's having hanged herself "right by the hals" when in Ovid this mode of death is only suggested in a picturesque way as one of several she pondered her choice of while lamenting her departed lover. We are tempted at once to conclude that Chaucer kept his Boccaccio open beside his Ovid—but not the *De Claris Mulieribus*, as one might think, for these two heroines, Phillis and Ariadne, are not there treated, certainly at least not in Donato's translation.<sup>1</sup> Since Lounsbury points

<sup>1</sup> *Delle Donne Famose* . . . traduzione di M. Donato degli Albanzani di Casentino, Bologna, 1881.

out (ii, 232) that Chaucer by mistake makes Phillis the daughter of Lycurgus owing to a heading "De Phyllida Lycurgi filia" in the *De Genealogia Deorum* (xi, 25), it is there presumably that we should look for the story. This work is unfortunately not at hand, but in any case it would be of more immediate interest in connection with the *Legend of Good Women*, the following parallel would certainly seem to show that the story as given in the *House of Fame* may be at once referred to the inspiration of the *Amorosa Visione*.

Boccaccio (cap. xxii) tells it as follows:—

Io che andava avanti riguardando  
 Vidi quiri Teseo nel Laberinto  
 Al Minotauro pauroso andando  
 Ma poichè quel con ingegno ebbe vinto,  
 Che gli diede Arianna, quindi uscire  
 Lui vedev' io di gioïa dipinto;  
 Al quale appresso Arianna venire,  
 E con lei Fedra salir nel suo legno  
 E quindi forte a suo poter fuggire.  
 Nel quale avendo già l'animo pregno  
 Del piacer di Arianna, *lei lasciare*  
*Vedea dormendo, e girsene al suo regno.*  
 Gridando desta la vedeva stare  
 E lui chiamava piangendo, e *solella*  
*Sopr'un deserto scoglio in mezzo al mare:*  
 Oimè, dicendo, deh, perchè s'affretta  
 Sì di fuggir tua nave? Abbi pietate  
 Di me ingannata, lassa, giovinetta.  
 Segando se ne già l'onde salate  
 Con Fedra quegli, e Fedra si tenea  
 Per vera sposa per la sua biltate.

The general correspondence in manner and method to Chaucer's rendering would be sufficiently marked to attract attention, even if there were not so distinct a parallel as that between the passages in italics and the following (*H. F.* 415-420).

"For after this, within a whyle  
 He lefte hir slepinge in an yle,  
 Deserte alone, right in the se,  
 And stal away, and leet hir be;  
 And took hir suster Phedra tho  
 With him, and gan to shippe go."

Chaucer's treatment of the story of Demophon and Phillis likewise in general method suggests Boccaccio's, even though unlike Boc-

caccio he specifies the method of her death. The likeness is in fact more than a general one. It is Boccaccio (cap. xxv) not Chaucer who summarises Ovid with his:

"ricordandoli ancora  
 Quant' ella e le sue cosa tutto pronte  
 Al suo servigio fùrono,"

for it is this, her ministry, upon which Ovid dwells, and Ovid's single reference to Demophon's perjured lips (l. 31 f.)

jura, fides ubi nunc, commissaque dextera  
 dextrae

quique erat in falso plurimus ore deus  
 does not so much seem the original of Chaucer's (389, 395 f.)

"How he forswar him ful falsly. . . .  
 . . . he had do hir swich untrouthe  
 Lo! was not this a wo and routhe?"

as Boccaccio's

"com' ora

A lei fallita la promessa fede  
 Per troppo amor dolor greve l'accora."

Apart from these correspondences it seems worthy of remark in how similar a way in both poems the story of Aeneas and Dido is introduced and dwelt upon save, that Chaucer treats it at greater length. Even here suggestions of direct indebtedness are not lacking, although Chaucer avers (ll. 311 ff.)

"In swiche wordes gan to pleyne  
 Dido of hir grete payne,  
 As we mette redely;  
 Non other auctour alegge I."

This is an amusing assertion considering Chaucer's general reticence concerning Boccaccio, and the fact that the lines 321 ff.,

"O, that your love, ne your bonde  
 That ye have sworn with your right honde,  
 Ne my cruel death', quod she,  
 May holde you still heer with me!"

is Virgil literally (l. 307 f.)

nec te noster amor, nec te data dextera quon-  
 dam

nec moritura tenet crudeli funere Dido.

It is Boccaccio not Virgil, that we have in Dido's prayer for pity as well as in her plea that she is guiltless of injury towards him. Chaucer says (ll. 315-18, etc.)



"Allas!" quod she, "my swete herte,  
Have pitee on my sorwes smerte,  
And slee ne not! go noight away! . . .  
O, haveth of my death pitee!  
Ywis, my dere herte, ye  
Knownen ful wel that never yit.  
As fer-forth as I hadde wit,  
Agilte [I] ow in thoght ne deed.  
O, have ye men suich goodliheed  
In speche, and never a deel of trouthe? . . ."  
which corresponds to Boccaccio (cap. xxviii):

"Oimè, Enea, or che t'aveva io fatto  
Che fuggendo disii il mio morire?  
Non è questo servir tra noi quel patto  
Che tui mi promettesti; or m'è palese.  
L'inganno c'hai coperto con falso atto.  
Deh, non fuggir, se l'esser mi cortese  
Forse non vogli, vincati pietate  
Almen de tuoi."

That Chaucer and Boccaccio differ from Virgil in giving the appeal of Dido this turn will appear if we glance at the only passage of corresponding import in the *Æneid* (ll. 317 ff.):—

si bene quid de te merui fuit aut tibi quicquam  
dulce meum, miserere domus labentes et  
istam,

oro, siquis adhuc precibus lccus, exue mentem.

Apart from these cases, in which Chaucer has used the same material to the same purpose, others no doubt might be, and in time will be, pointed out where he has simply availed himself of a poetic suggestion. We may close with an example of this, which readily offers itself. When the eagle tells Chaucer to what a vast height they have soared, he makes reference to Icarus (l. 919):

"Ne eek the wrecche Dedalus,  
Ne his child, nice Icarus.  
That fleighe so highe that the hete  
His winges malt, and he fel wete  
In-mid the see, and ther he dreynthe,  
For whom was maked moch compleynte."

Put beside this Boccaccio (cap. xxxv):—

Appresso vedi que' che con sottile  
Magisterio del padre uscì volando  
Del Laberinto, che tenendo vile  
Miseramente ciò, ch'ammaestrando  
Il padre gli avea detto, per volare  
Troppo alto, in giù le sue reti spennando  
Ora si cala, e appresso affogare  
Più là il vedi ne' salati liti:

The mere fact of common reference to Icarus means of course nothing, but the similarity in character and method, in style and general dimensions, is unmistakable. It is in brief passages like this that Boccaccio now and then succeeds—giving us a graphic picture in miniature and in simple words almost as successfully as Chaucer. But unfortunately he restrains his native humor. The austere seriousness of Petrarch and Dante made it

seem to him unfitting in verse.

Chaucer's mythology was probably Boccaccio's. If this is true and Chaucer owed to Boccaccio the fuller form of stories in the *Legend of Good Women* and elsewhere, the world may be just a shade less unforgiving towards Petrarch for having drawn Boccaccio away from his true calling as a fabulist and maker of exquisite prose in the mother-tongue, to become the Lemprière of his time in a Latin said to be not faultless and certainly without meaning or message for the latter day.

C. G. CHILD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## INDIANA PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Indiana Philological Society was held in Indianapolis, on May 24th and 25th, 1895. As on previous occasions, the first session was devoted to the discussion of pedagogical topics, the second to the reading of more or less technical papers. The Modern Languages were this time represented by two papers only! "Art in the Faerie Queen," by Miss M. E. Lewis of Coates College; and "A Few Passages in Goethe's Faust," by your correspondent. A third paper, on "The Epigram," by J. H. Howard of Indiana University, reached somewhat into our domain, in so far as the speaker dealt largely with Lessing's views on the subject. The numerous contributions pertaining to Classical Philology were mostly the result of careful work. Altogether, however, the usual mistake was made: an overcrowded program was gone through hastily, little or no allowance being made for discussions or for personal intercourse. A genuine and sound interest was taken in the pedagogical part of the meeting. The subjects discussed were: "Literal vs. Idiomatic Translations," introduced by J. S. Johnson of De Pauw University; and "Language Preparation for Admission to Indiana Colleges: What should be demanded and how may this be secured?" On motion of your correspondent, it was resolved that the Indiana Philological Society appoint a committee of five members, one from each of the five departments represented, who shall act as the organ of the Society during the following year. It shall be their duty to investigate the condition of affairs in regard to language instruction in Indiana, to make suggestions for the improvement of the same, to confer with educational authorities and organizations, and to try in every way to bring about some concerted action throughout the state in the direction of improvement.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

*Indiana University.*



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, November, 1895.

## EDUCATIONAL ENGLISH.

No careful observer of the signs of the times can fail to see that there is a revival of English Learning in the closing decade of the nineteenth century as truly as there was a Revival of Classical Learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Nor is such an awakening of interest and effort confined to any one section of the English world; to any one class of English students, or to any one department of English instruction and research. In England and her Colonies, and in our own country; among older and younger students; in the sphere of criticism, philology and literature, the movement is manifest; so that what most concerns us is to note its salient characteristics as a movement, the causes to which it owes its origin and impulse, the evidences of its enlargement and permanence, and its beneficent influence upon all related studies and activities.

In the wide variety of topics thus suggested, some of which, we trust, may engage the attention of our English students, there is one deserving of special emphasis. We refer to the unwonted interest now exhibited in what we have called Educational English, the study of English Composition and Criticism, English Language and Literature, from the educational point of view, and with primary reference to educational ends, as such ends are to be subserved in the secondary school, the college and the university. Such an interest can scarcely be called an awakening. It is really a new departure in our English work in America, and bids fair to do more for us in the line of making English what it ought to be among us than any principle or method that has hitherto obtained.

In a recent paper in MOD. LANG. NOTES on "Promising Tendencies in English Studies," we called attention to the excellent work then under way at the hands of The Committee of Fifteen in reorganizing the relations of secondary and collegiate English, and placing the whole subject on firmer and safer and more

rational foundations. To this Committee more than to any other one agency is this new departure due, by which the educational and educating features of our vernacular have been brought into prominence, by which, as Addison and Bacon would say, English has been brought down from the clouds into the common activities of men. We are beginning to learn that the study of our language and literature has a disciplinary side to it, which is, indeed, an important feature of its character as educational. Not only is it didactic in the sense of imparting needed information, but directly stimulating and provocative of thought, and conducive to general mental vigor. Much less is it exclusively or primarily aesthetic in its nature and purpose, and he who approaches and discusses it on such a plane as this has but the faintest conception of what he has in hand, or the purpose of it. We are just beginning to make a *business* of studying English; not in any merely commercial or unduly practical sense, but in the sense of making it a real study in real earnest for definite results in the character, culture, discipline, education, and practical usefulness of those who pursue it. In no one particular is this growing prominence of Educational English seen more fully and more practically than in those successive collections of the best English authors recently prepared and now preparing, whose main object is to familiarize students in the early stages of their student life with "the best that is known and thought in the [English] world." Publishers are vying with each other to secure and issue these serials, while among authors themselves there is a generous and growing rivalry in presenting these editions in authoritative, helpful and attractive form.

Such is "The Athenaeum Press Series," with its admirable volumes already issued by Professors Schelling, Gummere, Phelps and others. So, we have the serials under the suggestive titles—"English Readings for Students," "English Classics for Schools," and "Students' Series of English Classics," in each of which excellent collections the educational element is distinctive. Introductions,

texts and notes are prepared with primary regard to the needs of the student, and on such wise that he may be led by a well-adjusted gradational process through the related provinces of English authorship.

One of the most praiseworthy characteristics of these books is that no unnatural distinctions are made between English Composition, so-called, and English Literature, or between either of these and the English Language. The student is thus taught how to write clear, cogent and correct English, not so much through the medium of any formal rhetorical method as by seeing for himself how the best English writers have written. So, the English Language is best learned as to diction, structure and general uses, by becoming familiar with those authors who have used it best. With this end in view, the Committee on Uniform Entrance Examinations wisely suggested "that the candidate's proficiency in composition should be judged from his answers," and "that formal grammar and exercises and the correction of incorrect English should in no case be more than a subordinate part of the examination." Formal Rhetoric has had its day, and happily so, and, in so far as the best needs of advancing students are concerned, formal literature, and even formal philology, may be so relegated to the past.

In the series known as "English Readings for Students" (Holt & Co.), there is a kind of sub-series, aiming to represent "the study of method in various forms of written composition." The four initial volumes are: *Specimens of Narration* (Brewster); *Specimens of Prose Description* (Baldwin); *Specimens of Exposition* (Lamont); *Specimens of Argumentation* (Baker). We commend these books most heartily to teachers of English, especially in our secondary schools, as books constructed on a rational principle of the coördination of criticism, language and literature, by which all formal distinctions are effaced, and the art of expression presented in its unity. All this is in the direct line of Educational English, and, in the best sense, disciplinary. These books, and such as these, are, in fact, supplying a lack in our school and college libraries which, as far as we can see,

could be met in no other way, placing the choicest reading in the hands of every student at the minimum cost and in convenient form for use and reference.

In speaking of these series, those who are engaged in preparing them will pardon, we are sure, a single suggestion, to the effect that the selections given from the prose and verse of any author should be strictly representative, and full enough to give a connected and logical account of the author's work. It would be invidious, of course, to cite instances, but some of these editions are made up of what we might term, the shreds and bits of literature. They are scrappy and piece-meal in their character. The samples shown are too limited, so as to make it difficult to form an estimate of the author's work as a whole. What Coleridge calls The Law of Sequence, must be observed. Hence, good examples of this editorial work are given us in one of the plays of Shakespeare, or one of the Oration of Webster, or one of the poems of Milton, each complete in itself and studied as a unit.

Nor is a word out of place to the effect that editing is one thing, and creative authorship is another and a higher thing. In the present rightful enthusiasm obtaining among us in the work of presenting and interpreting the writings of others, good care is to be taken that this be kept, after all, subordinate to original research and production on the part of the editor. There is a danger lest the old literary masters exercise too vigorous a mastery, and the rising school of American scholars in English become simply a school of criticism and exposition.

In fine, English is fully holding its own in America in the modern and growing competition of studies, engaging more brains than ever before, pursued on more sensible methods than ever before, and guaranteed, thus, to secure more practical and permanent results than ever. No rising American scholar need ask a more inspiring and useful mission than to be allowed to take some part in this most important work.

T. W. HUNT.

Princeton College.



## TWO SPANISH MANUSCRIPT CANCIONEROS.

THE prolonged Spanish occupation of portions of Italy must at one time have made Spanish books and manuscripts quite plentiful in that country. A very important collection, consisting entirely of Spanish dramas, now preserved in the Bibliotheca Palatina at Parma, has been described by Prof. Restori of Pavia.<sup>1</sup> Manuscript *Cancioneros*, or collections of lyrical poetry, seem, however, to be of very rare occurrence in the Italian libraries.

Prof. Teza of the University of Naples describes such a collection: *Di una Antologia inedita di versi spagnuoli fatta nel secento*, in the *Atti del Real Istituto Veneto* vii, 6. Ser., Fasc. 6, Venezia, 1888-89, pp. 709-739, a publication that is inaccessible to me, and the notice of which I take from a "Satzprobe" of the *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Romanischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Karl Vollmüller*, München, 1891, p. 232.<sup>2</sup> The public libraries of Milan contain no MS. *cancioneros*, and the only one in St. Mark's library in Venice, has been described and numerous extracts from it have been published by Mussafia.<sup>3</sup> The Bibliotheca Nazionale of Florence, however, contains the two following *cancioneros*, both of the seventeenth century. Cf. Catalogue, p. 223, *Cod. cccliii*, marked D. 353: *Var. poesie spagnuole copiate da Monsignor Girolamo da Sommaria. Cod. chart. in 40. saec. xvii.*

<sup>1</sup> La Collezione CC. iv. 28033 della Bibliotheca Palatina-Parmense. Fasc. 15 (vol. vi) of *Studi di Filologia Romana*. Roma, 1891. One of these plays has since been published: Don Baltasar de Caravajal, *La Bandolera de Flandes* (*El Hijo de la Tierra*), *Commedie Spagnuole del Secolo xvii, sconosciute, inedite o rare pubblicate dal Dr. Antonio Restori, Halle, 1893.* (Romanische Bibliothek, ed. Förster.)

<sup>2</sup> Since this notice was written there has appeared: Alfonso Miola, *Notizie di Manoscritti Neolatini della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli. Parte prima.* Napoli, 1895. A description of the MS. used by Prof. Teza, together with an Index of first lines is given on pp. 37-46.

<sup>3</sup> *Ein Beitrag zur Bibliographie der Cancioneros aus der Marcusbibliothek in Venedig, Separatabdruck aus den Sitzb. d. Phil.-hist. Cl.*, liv. Bd. 1 Hft. On p. 91, "O triste partida mia," l. 13, read *quiteis* instead of *quereis*; p. 105, "Venciste al rrey Africano," l. 3, read *por tu mano*; p. 133, read "Oyga tu merced y crea."

- I. Don Luys de Gongora, canonigo de Cordova. Poesie. pag. 1 et alibis parsim.
- β. Forse dell'istesso: Parafrasi in versi spagnuoli delle odi di Orazio Flacco 5, 11, 14 e 22 del Libro 1, dell'ode 10 del libro ii; dell'ode 9 e 10, Lib. iii, dell'ode 13 Lib. iv, e dell'ode 2 degli epodi. pag. 191-196.
- γ. Romance de la entrada de los Reyes D. Phelipe, etc., p. 97.
- δ. A Lope de Vega, p. 13.
- ε. A la entrada de la Duquesa de Lerma, p. 15.
- ζ. A Don Diego de Mendoza, p. 16.
- II. El Conde de Salinas. Soneto. p. 30.
- III. Fray Luys de Leon. Poesie, pp. 60, 177. The latter is a "Cancion à Nuestra Señora, de Fray Luys de Leon, estando preso el año 1576."
- IV. Don Alvaro de Luna. Romance, p. 101, begins: "Aquella Luna hermosa," printed in Duran, *Roman. Gen.* ii No. 998. and entitled, "Testamento de Don Alvaro de Luna."
- V. El Frayle Benito, Coplas, p. 241; beginning: "Solamente en los fregones."
- VI. Lope de Vega, Poesie, p. 298.
- VII. Hussein, Ambaxador de Persia, Poesie Spagnuole, pp. 299, 303.
- VIII. El P. Controverde Agostiniano predicador del Rey, son en muerte de D. Phelipe II, p. 318.
- IX. Elegia de Ovidio que comienza *Aestus erat* en el Lib. i, traducida por el Vicentino, p. 319.
- X. Inscrizioni sepolcrali che sono nella chiesa maggiore de Lisboa, p. 247.
- XI. Pasquinate, p. 321 (Ital).
- XII. Adagiorum centuriae V. p. 349, sono proverbi latini.
- XIII. Anon. de numero ternario, quinario et noveno, pag. 481.

The volume begins with the "Soneto al saco de Cadiz," año de 1596, de Don Luys de Gongora, beginning: "Vimos en Julio una semana sancta."

The sonnet to Lope de Vega, p. 13, is as follows:



A tñ, Lope de Vega, el eloquente  
 Repentino poeta acelerado,  
 Morador de la fuente del mercado  
 Sustentado con sangre de inocente,  
 Hanme dicho que dizes de repente  
 Y que de tu dezir estás pagado,  
 Y tambien que arrojas de pensado  
 Coplones que caminan a las ueyate.  
 Huelgome dello, Lope, y gusto mucho  
 Del rumbo que traheys y la braueza;  
 Sed buen hijo, serui a D<sup>a</sup> Hulana,  
 Que á fñ de pobre que lo que escucho  
 Es murmurar de uos mucha pobreza  
 Con uanagloria y presuncion ufana.

The MS. contains a number of ballads not in Duran:

p. 95. "Al pie de una seca encina;"

p. 96. "Recostado está Siluero  
 al pie de una fuente clara,"

p. 97, "Romance de la entrada de los Reyes  
 Phelipe y Doña Margarita de Austria en Sala-  
 manca," año de 1600, beginning: "Despues  
 que llegado fueron."

P. 349 follows "Adagiorum centuriae quinque:  
 Amo de muchos, lobos se lo comen  
 Multitudo imperatorum Cariam perdidit, etc.  
 P. 390. Capanna di Tirsi:

"Doue con le sue fresch'e lucid' onde."

The other volume is described in the Cata-  
 logue as follows: Cod. cccliv (marked D. 354),  
 "Poesie spagnuole copiate da Arnaldo came-  
 riere di Monsig. Girol. da Sommaria. Cod.  
 chart. in 4<sup>o</sup>. saec. xviii. Indice: Obras de  
 Don Diego de Mendoça desde la pr<sup>a</sup> hoja  
 hasta h<sup>a</sup> 228.

Obras del Frayle Benito desde 232 hasta h<sup>a</sup> 348.  
 Obras de Fray Luys de Leon desde 350 hasta  
 el fin.

The first rubric is: Obras del muy illustre  
 cauallero y excelentissimo Poeta Don Diego  
 de Mendoça, Embaxador por el Rey Nuestro  
 Señor en Turquia, Venecia, Roma, y Inglaterra.  
 fol 1: Don Diego de Mendoça al Cardinal  
 Espinosa.<sup>4</sup> Illustrisimo Señor: El Governa-  
 dor de Breza, estando el Emperador en Pala-  
 cio, prendió el Alcalde Ronguillo en Vallado-  
 lid: Gutierre Lopez de Padilla desafió en  
 Palacio y mató en Alcaudete á Don Diego  
 Pacheco, el Duque de Gandia y Don Luys de  
 la Cueva pusieron mano á las espadas delante  
 del Emperador en Çaragoça, el marques, etc.

<sup>4</sup> This Cardinal Espinosa was Diego de Espinosa, who  
 died Septbr. 15, 1572.

Fol. 2. Muy mag<sup>co</sup> señor. Porque me manda  
 Vm. le escriba muy largo en que andan mis  
 negocios, y como me va en esta, etc. Fol. 13,  
 El Bachiller al Capitan Salazar: La fama como  
 es recuer[d]o general del mundo, a llegado á  
 esta corte de Roma cargada de las victorias  
 del emperador nuestro señor, y pensando  
 pasarlo embuelto entre ellas como doblon de  
 plomo, venia asimismo, etc. Fol. 23: Res-  
 puesta del Capitan al Bachiller. Fol. 31:  
 Soneto. "El hombre que doliente está de  
 muerte," followed by the sonnet "Dias can-  
 sados, duras horas tristes." The last poem  
 by Mendoza is Penolope (sic) y Ulises, fol. 227.

The poems of Fray Benito begin on page  
 232 with the following poem:

Una viuda en Aragon, viuia  
 que tanto en castidad se senalaua, etc.

The Obras de don Luys de Leon begin on  
 fol. 351<sup>v</sup> with

"Vida descansada":  
 "Que descansada vida, etc."

Want of time, and the inability to procure  
 in the Florence library, any edition whatever  
 of the poems of Gongora, Luys de Leon or  
 Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, must be my ex-  
 cuse for the above very imperfect description  
 of two manuscripts that are certainly not  
 without interest. Both are carefully written,  
 the latter (D. 354), being a beautiful piece of  
 work, and should be taken into account, to-  
 gether with MS. 311 of the National Library  
 at Paris,<sup>5</sup> should anyone venture to re-edit  
 the works of Mendoza.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

### THE MISPLACEMENT OF *Only*.

It is the purpose of this article to examine  
 with some care the so-called misplacement of  
 the adverb *only*,<sup>1</sup> as exemplified in the sen-  
 tence, "He only spake three words."

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Morel-Fatio, "L'Arte Mayor et l'hendecasyllabe  
 dans la poésie Castellane du xve siècle et du commencement  
 du xvie," p. 22. Extrait de la *Romania*, tome xxiii. Paris,  
 1894.

<sup>1</sup> To Mr. R. O. Williams, whose paper on this subject ap-  
 peared in the April number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, I tender  
 my apologies. If I seem to poach on his preserves, I can  
 only plead (or shall I say plead only?) that my conclusions  
 were reached some little time before the publication of his.

The earliest opinion on the subject that I have found recorded anywhere is in Bishop Lowth's *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*, published in London in 1763. In the edition of 1767, which alone I have had an opportunity of consulting, the passage reads as follows: "The adverb, as its name imports, is generally placed close or near to the word, which it modifies or affects, and its propriety or force depends on its position." Then (in a foot-note): "Thus it is commonly said, 'I only spake three words;' when the intention of the writer manifestly requires, 'I spake only three words.'" (P. 146.)

In 1776, Dr. Geo. Campbell, in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, touched upon the same subject:

"In the next quotation the homonymous term may be either adjective or adverb, and admits a different sense in each acceptance:

'Not only Jesuits can equivocate.'

If the word *only* is here an adverb, the sense is, 'To equivocate is not the only thing that Jesuits can do.' This interpretation, though not the author's meaning, suits the context. A very small alteration in the order gives a proper and unequivocal, though a prosaic expression of the sense: 'Jesuits can not only equivocate.' Again if the word *only* is here an adjective (and this, doubtless, is the author's intention), the sense is, 'Jesuits are not the only persons who can equivocate.' But this interpretation suits ill the composition of the sentence." (p. 252.)

In 1783 appeared Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. Discussing in Lecture eleven the syntax of adverbs, the author calls attention to the 'nicety' of their position when they are "used to qualify the signification of something which either precedes or follows them." As illustration, he cites a passage from Addison's *Spectator*, No. 412: "By greatness I do not only mean the bulk of any single object, but the largeness of a whole view." "Here," says Dr. Blair, "the place of the adverb *only*, renders it a limitation of the following word *mean*. 'I do not only mean.' The question may then be put, What does he more than mean? Had he placed it after *bulk*, still it would have been wrong. 'I do not mean the bulk only' of any single object. For we might then ask, What does he mean more than the bulk? Is it the *the* colour? Or any other property? Its proper place, undoubtedly, is after the word

object. 'By greatness, I do not mean the bulk of any single object only; for then, when we put the question, What does he more than mean than the bulk of a single object? the answer comes out exactly as the author intends, and gives it, the largeness of a whole view.'"

Dr. Blair's conclusion is as follows:

"The fact is, with respect to such adverbs as *only*, *wholly*, at least, and the rest of that tribe, that in common discourse, the tone and emphasis we use in pronouncing them, generally serves to show their reference, and to make the meaning clear; and hence we acquire a habit of throwing them in loosely in the course of a period. But, in writing, where a man speaks to the eye, and not to the ear, he ought to be more accurate, and so to connect those adverbs with the words which they qualify, as to put his meaning out of doubt, upon the first inspection."<sup>2</sup>

The opinions expressed by Lowth, Campbell, and Blair, are echoed by all except a very few of the authorities who come after them.<sup>3</sup> Of these exceptions, the most important are Maetzner and Bain. Maetzner wrote in 1865; Bain, in 1874. According to Maetzner, the rule for the use of *only* is as follows: If *only* qualifies a single notion, such as an adjective or adverb, it usually stands before it; but if *only* is detached from its reference to a single

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lecture 21, in which the criticism of the passage from Addison is repeated.

<sup>3</sup> Into the *selva selvaggia* of English grammars I do not pretend to have penetrated very deeply. The number examined, however, has been large enough to guard against any serious oversight. Among the most important of those I have consulted are the following: Wm. Hazlitt's *A New and Improved Grammar*, London, 1810, professedly based on Lowth's Introduction; Lindley Murray's *English Grammar*, which in its comment on the use of *only* follows Blair; Wm. Cobbett's *Grammar of the English Language*, Letter xxi; Chas. Coote's *Elements of the Grammar of the English Language*; Peter Bullions' *The Principles of English Grammar*; Gould Brown's *Grammar of English Grammars*; J. Walker's *Rhetorical Grammar*; and W. C. Fowler's *The English Language in its Elements and Forms*. The rhetorics have been examined with greater thoroughness; I do not think I have overlooked one; but since with few exceptions they contribute nothing, or next to nothing, to the solution of the problem, it is not worth while taking space to enumerate them. The same remark may be made upon works which deal with the subject of English usage. From one of these last, however, I cannot forbear to quote. Gould's *Good English*, a very menagerie of wild opinions, comments as follows on the use of *only*: "The misplacing of the word *only* is so common, so absolutely universal, one may almost say that only cannot be found in its proper place in any book within the whole range of English literature."



notion, and refers to the predicate generally, it may take some other place. (*Englische Grammatik*, Bd. 3, p. 584.) The example given is: "I have only been six days at St. Petersburg." (Bulwer, *Devereux*, 5, 2.)

Prof. Bain, in his *English Grammar as bearing upon Composition*, out of sixty-three pages given to "Order of Words," devotes three to a discussion of the placement of *only*. In the view of Prof. Bain, the place of this adverb is governed by two laws, the law of Proximity and the law of Priority. The law first requires that the qualifying word be placed near the word qualified. The second law rests upon two considerations: first, that the qualification usually precedes the thing qualified (cf. Spencer's *Philosophy of Style*), so that "if a qualifying word lies between two words and is not specially excluded from the one that precedes, the principle of order would make us refer it to the one that follows;" second, that a qualifying word qualifies all that follows until we come to a break in the sentence. Applying these principles to the word *only*, Prof. Bain derives the following rule of practice; "In composition the only safe rule is to place the subject to be restricted after the 'only.'" To this rule he makes but one exception, though an important one, as I shall try to show later. He says that the sentence, "He only came home yesterday" is hardly worth changing to "He came home only yesterday," for the reason that

"there is something gained by interposing before 'came home' the intended qualification. We expect after the verb a simple unqualified date—'he came yesterday, last Tuesday.' When the meaning is that he might have been much sooner but did not actually arrive till yesterday, there is a want of some qualification prefixed. 'He did not come till yesterday,' is the full expression, but rather long and formal for colloquial address."

To these opinions of Prof. Bain very little has since been added. Prof. Genung, writing in 1887, allows no exception to the stringent rule. "It is undoubtedly a fact," he admits, "due to the so frequent misplacing of *only*, that people make the adjustment of sense unconsciously. But this should not be taken as an excuse for the incorrect usage." The most recent comment on this use of *only* oc-

curs in an article by Mr. R. O. Williams, published in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. 10, pp. 67, 68. Bringing together examples from about thirty authors, ranging in time from Sir Philip Sidney to Rudyard Kipling, Mr. Williams draws the conclusion that sentences of the type "He only spake three words" occur so frequently as to leave the impression that this type is more common than the type "He spake only three words." He notes also that sentences of the first type are particularly frequent in writers that show spontaneity.

The results of theorizing and investigation down to the present time may be summed up as follows: (1) There is pretty general agreement among grammarians and rhetoricians that the type of sentence represented by "He spake only three words" is preferable to the type of sentence "He only spake three words," provided we do not wish to contrast the verb *spake* with some other verb. (2) With but very few exceptions these writers maintain that *only* should always immediately precede the word upon which it operates. (3) Maetzner makes the so-called irregular form a special case; Prof. Bain adheres to the general rule, but notes an exception in the type of sentence represented by "He only came yesterday." (4) Mr. Williams holds that the type of sentence represented by "He only spake three words" is more frequent than the other type and is especially noticeable in writings characterized by spontaneity.<sup>4</sup>

Of the various principles suggested by these writers as explanations of the placement of *only*, the two principles of Prof. Bain's, Proximity and Priority, seem to me at once the simplest and the most comprehensive. If, in

<sup>4</sup> Since writing this article I have noticed that Prof. C. B. Bradley in his *Orations and Arguments*, p. 358, makes an illuminating comment on this sentence in one of Erskine's speeches: "It only remains to remind you that another consideration has been strongly impressed upon you and no doubt will be insisted on in reply." (Speech in Behalf of John Stockdale.) The following is Prof. Bradley's note "The position of the word *only* in a sentence is a matter which used to be determined almost wholly by considerations of euphony and rhythm. The claims of clearness and precision are now more generally recognized and we are apt to insist that the word be placed next to that which it qualifies. The difference is sharply brought out in this particular case. Odd as the sentence now sounds, it would be difficult unless we recast the whole, to find another place for *only* without destroying either sense or rhythm, or both."



addition, we bear in mind Prof. Bain's defence of "He only came yesterday," and take into our account the demands of rhythm, that most powerful of stylistic agencies, we have all the rhetorical principles we need. Let us see if we can explain by means of them the common examples of misplacement.

The various forms of sentence in which *only* is used as predicate adverb may be indicated diagrammatically as follows:

A.—verb+only+verb-qualifier.

In this type of sentence *only* operates on the verb-qualifier. Example: "He spake only three words."

Br.—only+verb+verb-qualifier.

In this type of sentence *only* operates on the predicate as a whole. Examples: "And besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment." (Et rogabant eum ut vel fimbriam vestimenti ejus tangerent. Matt. 14: 36.) "What would be best advised then, if it be found so hurtful and so unequal to suppress opinions for the newness or the unsuitableness to a customary acceptance, will not be my task to say; I only shall repeat what I have learnt from one of your own honorable number." (Milton, *Areopagitica*.)

B2.—only+verb+verb-qualifier.

In this type of sentence *only* passes over the verb to operate on the verb-qualifier. The following is perhaps an example: "Though we were ten days in Naples, I only saw one quarrel." (W. D. Howells, *Italian Journeys*, cited by F. Hall.)

B3.—only+verb+verb-qualifier.

In this type of sentence the operation of *only* is distributed over the verb and its qualifier. *Only* affects the verb in one way and the qualifier in a different way. The following example is from Bacon's essay *Of Building*:

"Beyond this court, let there be an inward court . . . ; on the under story towards the garden, let it be turned to grotto, or place of shade, or estivation, and only have opening and windows towards the garden."

In this sentence, as I interpret it, *only* modifies in one way the phrase 'have opening and windows' and in another way, 'towards the garden.'

Of these four possible arrangements, the first and second fall under the rule that *only* should immediately precede the word or words it modifies. The third, looked upon by most authorities as incorrect, is the form supposed to be exemplified in the sentences offered in text-books for correction. The last form is a common and in my opinion a correct form which has not as yet received adequate consideration. I will take up these various forms one by one.

In A, the force of *only* is directed upon the qualifier of the verb. The verb itself is unaffected. As we read the sentence, we accept the verb, when we come to it, at its face value, afterwards making such modification of our first impression as is called for by the qualifier. The verb, therefore, considered by itself, must be consistent with the qualification. Clearness may even require more than this, may require that there be something in the preceding part of the sentence to point the way to the qualification which the verb is to undergo. If this is not the case the qualification, when it comes, may call for a painful readjustment of the idea conveyed by the verb. It follows that sentences of this type, even if technically correct, may not meet all the requirements of clearness.

In Br, the verb and the qualifier fall in the same stress-group with the adverb *only*, and *only*, in consequence, operates upon the predicate as a whole. This type, since it meets all demands, does not call for further consideration.

In B2, *only* is expected to operate on the qualifier but not upon the intervening verb; but this expectation is usually disappointed. The verb, falling in the same stress-group as the qualifier, claims a share of the modification, and sometimes takes it all. Thus the aim of the writer is frustrated, and the sentence he produces is ambiguous. If clear sentences of this form are sometimes written, it is because in some cases the union of verb and adverb is seen to be impossible. Sentences of the form B2, when the rhythm per-

mits, should be converted into the form A.

In B<sub>3</sub>, the force of *only* is divided. Part of its force, going to the verb, provisionally negates or limits the face value of the verb, and warns us that something is to follow. The remainder of its force is expended on the qualifier.<sup>5</sup> The nature of the limitation imposed upon the verb may be made evident by re-wording a few examples of this type of sentence.

"I think he only loves the world for him."<sup>6</sup>  
(Shakespeare, *M. of V.*, ii. 8.)

Re-worded: I think he cares little for the world except on his account.

"He only lived but till he was a man."  
(Macbeth, v, 8.)

Re-worded: He did not live long—only till he was a man.

"We only believe as deep as we live."  
(Emerson, *Art.*)

Re-worded: Our belief is limited. We believe only as deep as we live.

"The fraud could only be counteracted by an edition equally cheap and more commodious." (Johnson, *Life of Pope*, cited by F. Hall.)

Re-worded: The fraud could not easily be counteracted—only by an edition, etc.

If the distinction drawn between B<sub>2</sub> and B<sub>3</sub> is correct, it follows that the process of conversion recommended for B<sub>2</sub> will not operate satisfactorily in the case of B<sub>3</sub>. Converting good sentences of this type into the type A may result in some loss of clearness. A few examples will bring out the force of this remark. Consider the first of the sentences

<sup>5</sup> The analogy of the French *ne . . . que* will suggest itself to the reader.

<sup>6</sup> It will be interesting to note the attempts of translators to render these originals: "Ich glaub' er liebt die Welt nur seinetwegen" -Schlegel and Tieck; "Ich glaub', er liebt die Welt nur noch um ihn" -Simrock; "Ich glaub', um ihn nur liebt er noch die Welt" -Moriz Rapp; "Ich glaub um seinetwillen liebt er nur die Welt!" -J. W. O. Benda; "Est ist als lieb' er nur um ihn die Welt" -Bodenstedt Edition; "Je crois qu'il n'aime cette vie que pour Bassanio" -F. V. Hugo; "Er lebte nur bis er zum Mann gereift" -Ph. Kaufmann; "Il n'a vécu que les années nécessaires pour former l'homme" -Le Tournier (1778); "Vivió tan solo hasta hombre ser" -G. Macpherson; "Vivió hasta ser hombre, y con su her'ica muerte probó que era digno de serlo" -Menendez Pelayo; "Ἀνδρας γὰρ γείνῃ μάλιστα ἐφθασε" -D. Bikelos.

cited above, "I think he only loves the world for him." Recasting this sentence in the form A, we have, "I think he loves the world only for him." But in this form the first part of the sentence is momentarily misleading. To the reader who has formed a correct conception of Antonio, the words "I think he loves the world," if he accepts them at their face value, seem to promise a startling revelation of character. But this promise is immediately broken by the appearance of the restrictive adverb. The presence of *only* before the verb is evidence of the author's unwillingness to leave us in doubt, even for an instant, with regard to the true value of the verb.<sup>7</sup> Other examples of non-convertible sentences are the following:

"The awfully smart boy is only smart—in the worst American sense of the word—as his own family make him so." (L. Hutton, "Literary Notes," *Harper's Mag.*, vol. 80.)

"Philosophy, in the true sense of that word, never destroys an ideal that is worth preserving. Coming to consciousness of yourself can only bring to light weakness in case the weakness already exists in you." (J. Royce, *Spirit of Modern Philosophy*, p. 18.)

"He often had to stay in Washington two or three months before he could accomplish his purpose, and in too many cases he only did accomplish it finally at the expense of some poor fellow who was already in the departments, but who no longer had influence sufficient to insure his detention." (T. Roosevelt, "The Merit System," *Cosmopolitan*, May, 1892.)

On the other hand, when by the context, or by our personal knowledge (which is a kind of context), we are warned of what is coming, the form B<sub>3</sub> may be inferior to A. Thus when Mr. Howells in *Tuscan Cities*, p. 208, writes, "The landlord took off a charge for two pigeons when we represented that he had only given us one for dinner," we are warned by the words 'took off a charge' that 'had given' is to be taken with a negative limitation. In this case the arrangement 'had given us only one for dinner' (considerations of rhythm a-

<sup>7</sup> Intentional postponement of the adverb for comic effect is aptly illustrated in the following quotation:

*Gremio.* And if I die to-morrow, this is hers,  
If whilst I live she will be only mine.

*Tranio.* That 'only' came well in.  
(Shakespeare, *T. of S.* ii, 1.)



side,) is preferable to the arrangement, 'had only given us one for dinner.'

FRED N. SCOTT.

University of Michigan.

### THE AUTHORSHIP OF FLAMENCA.\*

AN approximate date can be given of only two of Peire Rogier's poems. The one "Senh'en Raymbaut, per uezer . . .," addressed to Raimbaut d'Aurenga, must have been written before 1173, the year of Raimbaut's death.<sup>1</sup> The other is "Per far esbaudir mos uezis . . ."

"e uenc s'en," says the Provençal biography of Peire Rogier,<sup>2</sup> "a Narbona en la cort de ma dompna n'Esmengarda . . . lonc temps estet ab ella en cort e si fon crezut q'el agues ioi d'amor d'ella, don ella en fo blasmada per las gens. e det li comiat e'l partit de si. et el s'en anet a'n Raembaut d'Aurenga . . . lonc temps estet ab en Raembaut d'Aurenga. (e puous s'en partic de lui) . . ."

As Raimbaut died in 1173, we may put Peire Rogier's arrival at his court about 1170 and his arrival at Narbonne several years earlier. Further, the poem "Per far esbaudir mos uezis . . .," being the first of Peire Rogier's songs to Esmengarda,<sup>3</sup> must have been written before 1170.

The second tornada of this poem reads as follows:

Bastart, tu uay  
e porta'm lay  
mon sonet a mon Tort-n'auetz;  
e di'm a n'Aimeric lo tos  
membre'lh dont es e sia pros.<sup>4</sup>

Aimeric was born the son of Manrique de Lara and Ermessinda, sister of Esmengarda.<sup>5</sup> He would scarcely have been mentioned in a poem to Esmengarda, unless he was at this time at the court of Esmengarda. From 1167 on, Aimeric's name appears by the side of that of Esmengarda in documents.<sup>6</sup> But might he not have come earlier to Narbonne?

\* Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, May 1895.

<sup>1</sup> Appel, *Das Leben und die Lieder des Trobadors Peire Rogier*, Berlin 1882, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8, note.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.

<sup>5</sup> Appel, p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> 7, 8 *Ibid.*, p. 12. Appel only remarks that the marriage of Manrique and Ermessinda was blessed with many children.

Very likely not earlier than 1164, the year in which his father died<sup>7</sup> and when Esmengarda, to relieve his mother,<sup>8</sup> may have invited him to come to her court. Thus we have 1164 as the *terminus a quo* of the poem. Now, as the poem is the first in a series of songs to the praise of Esmengarda, most of which were composed before Peire Rogier left Esmengarda's court (about 1170), we shall not go wrong in putting the date of "Per far esbaudir mos uezis . . .," as well as that of Peire Rogier's arrival at Narbonne, not later than 1165.

This conjecture is supported by the last two lines of the tornada with regard to which Appel observes:

"Die ausdrückliche Bezeichnung lo tos 'der junge,' wie die Ermahnung scheinen auf grosse Jugend des Prinzen zu deuten. Das Jahr seiner Geburt ist uns nicht überliefert da aber die nur kurze Ehe der Eltern (Manrique starb 1164) reich an Kindern war, dürfen wir die Geburt Aimeric's als des ältesten in den Anfang der fünfziger Jahre legen."

As to Peire Rogier's earlier life, I quote the Provençal biography:<sup>10</sup>

"Peire Rotgiers si fo d'Aluergne; e fo canorges de Clarmon,<sup>11</sup> e fo gentils hom e bels et auinens e sauis de letras e de sen natural e cantaua e trobaua ben, e laissat la canorga e fetz se ioglar. et anet per cortz e foron grazit li sieu chantar. e uenc s'en a Narbona . . ."

It is almost certain that Peire Rogier was born before, or at least not later, than 1145.<sup>12</sup>

This assumption is strengthened by considering that Peire Rogier, calling Aimeric a "tos" and proffering to him paternal advice, was without doubt considerably older than Aimeric.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>11</sup> With the material at my disposal I am unable to determine at how early an age it was possible, in the latter half of the twelfth century, to become a canon. Cf. Herzog-Plitt, 2d ed., v. vii, pp. 506-16 and Wetzer-Welte, 2d ed., v. ii, 1823-42.

<sup>12</sup> Peire Rogier [1160-80]. Thus reads the heading of the poet's biography in Diez (LW d T., 2d ed., p. 79) and Mr. Henckels hastily concludes: "Diez says that Peire Rogier was born about 1160-80." Had Mr. H. only read the first two pages of the biography, he would have seen that the dates are meant for the time during which the poet flourished.



To speak finally of the *Roman de Flamenca*, the *terminus a quo* as well as the probable date of its composition are the years 1234-5.<sup>13</sup> Peire Rogier would have been at this time ninety years old. I have nothing further to add, although other reasons are not wanting why, even if he had been alive, he would not have been the author of *Flamenca*.

The striking similarity between Peire Rogier (Bartsch, C. pr., 4th ed., 84, 3) and the dialogue of Guillem and Flamenca<sup>14</sup> has to be explained as "imitation"<sup>15</sup> of Peire Rogier by the author of *Flamenca*.

K. PIETSCH.

*The Newberry Library, Chicago.*

### THE ELL AND YARD.

THERE has been some discussion in the last few years over the origin of the expression "de ell an' yard" (the sword and belt of Orion), which occurs several times in the writings of Joel Chandler Harris.

Until recently this discussion seems to have been confined to our own country; now, from across the ocean comes a breath of interest and curiosity.

The March number of *The Observatory*, an Astronomical magazine published at Greenwich, refers to it as of interest to those who care to collect astronomical allusions and references in contemporary literature.

It refers to a Christmas story by "Q" in the *Pall Mall Budget*, in which a plantation song is introduced, and says that the author claims that the expression "de los' ell an' yard" is genuine negro for Orion's sword and belt.

The refrain of Joel Chandler Harris' corn shucking song is as follows;

"Fer de los' ell an yard is a huntin' fer de mornin'  
En she'll ketch up widdus fo' we ever git dis corn in."

From a later edition of his works I quote also:

"It wuz dark, but the stars wuz a shinnin',  
an' Johnny could tell by the ell-an'-yard (the

<sup>13</sup> Revillout, Rdlr., v. viii, p. 16; Meyer, *Romania*, v. v, p. 123; Stimming, Grüber's *Grundr.*, v. 2, ii, p. 10.

<sup>14</sup> The discovery has been made already by Appel, p. 14, note 3.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Appel, p. 15, note 2; Diez, *Pd T.*, 2d ed., p. 21.

constellation of Orion) that it was nigh mid-night."

Dr. Thomas P. Harrison, takes this latter quotation and works out a very ingenious theory regarding the origin of the expression, which he has published in *MOD. LANG. NOTES* for April, 1893. He gives his article the title of "The Elnyard," and begins by saying that he was first led to believe that the expression "the ell and yard" referred to the pleiades, and gives his reasons. Later he says:

"The idea evolved in elnyard is made evident by the Ancient Swedish term for the Belt of Orion (cf. Jamison) that is Friggerock 'Freye's Distaff', which after the introduction of Christianity became Marirock, Mary's Distaff in Scotland (cf. *Century Dictionary*) Our Lady's Ellwand. Thus it seems that the three stars in the belt of Orion appeared to these people as projecting a line an ell in length."

"Mr. Harris" he says, "is evidently wrong in writing ell-an-yard the *m* is only the middle English ending as it appears in Elm (cf. *Century Dictionary*) for ell."

Let us try to supplement Dr. Harrison's work by Astronomical investigation.

First, taking an astronomy published side by side, as it were, with the *Observatory*, where the expression is quoted as "genuine negro," we find a very interesting description of Orion, that begins to throw some light on the subject.

In Smyth's *Cycle of Celestial Objects*, published in England in 1844, Orion is mentioned as the most beautiful and brilliant of all the constellations and the most noted among the Ancients.

In describing the stars in the belt and sword, many of the popular names for them are given; first the old Arabian ones, meaning the "Giant's belt" and the "Gold grains or span-gles."

Then we have "Jacob's Staff, perhaps from the traditional idea mentioned by Eusebius that Israel was an Astrologer."

Some of the other names mentioned are:

"The Golden Yard of Seamen, the Three Kings of Soothsayers, the *ell* and *yard* of tradesmen, the Rake of Husbandmen and Our Lady's wand of the Papists."

Coming back to our own country, where the expression is still in common use, we find in *The Wonders of the Heavens*, by Duncan

Bradford, Boston 1837, the sword and belt of Orion again spoken of as the "Yard and Ell" with a short description.

Going still farther back, E. H. Burritt A. M. in his *Geography of the Heavens*, published at Hartford, Conn., in 1833, gives a more detailed description. He says:

"Those four brilliant stars in the form of a long square or parallelogram, intersected in the middle by the 'Three Stars' or *ell and yard*—form the outlines of Orion."

Again, in speaking of the stars in the belt he says:

"They are usually distinguished by the name of the 'Three Stars' because there are no other stars in the heavens that exactly resemble them in position and brightness, etc., etc.

The more common appellation for them, including those in the sword, is the *ell and yard*. They derive the latter from the circumstance that the line which unites the three stars in the belt measures just 3° in length, and is divided by the central star into two equal parts like a yard stick; thus serving as a gradual standard for measuring the distances of stars from each other, etc., etc.

There is a row of stars south of the belt running obliquely . . . which forms the sword. This row is called the *ell* because it is once and a quarter the length of the *yard* or belt."

It has been asked repeatedly, "Why do they say, 'de los' ell an' yard?" That is undoubtedly a poetic fancy.

When Johnny can tell by their position in the heavens that it is near midnight, he does not say "de los' ell an' yard." He sees them. It is in the corn shucking song that they are lost.

The corn shucking in some parts of the South, as the rice gathering in others, was looked forward to as a festival season. It was often made in turn, on one plantation and then another, an all-night jollification, joined in by negroes of the neighboring plantations.

During the night songs were sung, often accompanied by a crude form of shuffling dance; jokes were passed around and refreshments liberally provided, were thoroughly enjoyed.

At this season of the year the *ell* and *yard* are below the horizon, or not visible till day-break. To the negro they are "lost," but he knows they will herald the day when a certain amount of corn is expected to be "in"

or housed, and the corn shucking ceases for the time.

His fancy pictures them while still below the horizon as waiting or hunting for the morning and in this poetic way he says:

"Fer de los' ell an' yard is a huntin' fer de mornin'  
En she'll ketch up widdus 'fo' we ever git dis corn in."

Or is it perhaps possible that from the same source which supplied the whole conception, a hazy idea was obtained of Orion the mighty hunter, who was beloved by the Dawn.

#### NOTE.

Since writing the above, an effort to find, if possible, some use or knowledge of the expression "The Ell and Yard" outside of the Southern states, has resulted in the discovery of a trace of it, in a perverted form, among the retired sea captains on Cape Cod; notably those who have spent most of their lives whaling.

One old captain who, I was told, knew more about lunar observations than any man on the end of the Cape, informed me that he had never heard of the Ell and Yard, but knew all about the Yard and L. His explanation of this was that the "three bright stars" were called the "Yard" because they resemble the yard-arm of a ship and when joined to the stars in the sword, they form the letter L.

Another form of the expression that was given me was simply the letter L. From that version the "Yard" had disappeared entirely.

ANNIE WESTON WHITNEY.

Baltimore, Md.

#### FRENCH THEATRE.

*Essai sur Favart et les Origines de la Comédie Mêlée de Chant.* Par AUGUSTE FONT.

Toulouse: Edouard Privat, 1894. 8vo, 350 pp.

THE origin and development of the *Opéra Comique* has been recently discussed in a work offered by M. Auguste Font to the Faculté des Lettres de Paris, as Doctor's thesis. An accurate history of this form of entertainment ought to throw a strong light on the manners and social tone of the eighteenth century in France since it is truly affirmed that the state of a people's civilization can be

judged by their choice of amusement, their moral condition by the character of the relaxation in which they indulge. It is most important that careful attention be given to this phase of a nation's life, and the investigations upon this theme should be of value. With Favart as a fixed point, the author goes back into the thirteenth century, and traces thence the gradual evolution of a species of popular expression, unique in itself, and peculiar to the people by whom it has been so inordinately cherished.

The writer was fortunate in having access to the documents purchased by the government at Favart's death, and now jealously guarded in the library of the Grand Opera House. These consist of three large portfolios filled with unsorted manuscripts and notes relating to his various plays. M. Font also makes use of the life of the poet by his grandson, and refers to contemporary literature, as well as to the large collections known as *Théâtre de la Foire* and *Théâtre Complet*. The matter offered is abundant, and the authorities quoted are most extensive; the presentation is sketchy and ill-balanced, but the research seems carefully made, and a complete list of the plays enhances the value of the essay. The treatment closes with a glance at Sedaine who encouraged and fostered the movement shaped by Favart. It covers six or eight centuries, going back to the love-songs of the troubadours and the lyrical contests of the age of chivalry.

To sing *chansons*, to hold tournaments of antiphonal verse or *jeu-partis*, to divert a goodly company with some romantic tale, partly recited and partly sung, was as natural to the French cavalier of the middle ages as language itself. The passion for song and dance is inborn in the lightsome Celt, and the pot-pourri performances given at that time in the open air, on the Pont Neuf, and in the public places of Paris, were only an outcome of this characteristic disposition. Tuneful and appealing airs, apt to seize the popular fancy were caught up by wandering musicians and thus scattered through the country. The minstrel left them singing behind him in every town through which he passed, and these *vaudevilles*, as they came to be called, were used again and again, always heard with un-

diminished pleasure, no matter to what words they were fitted, or with what ideas they were associated. They were heard on the street and in the homes of the people. Mme la Comtesse would warble absently a refrain at her toilette, and the King himself might hum some tune while sitting in his cabinet. In course of time these airs, through frequent adaptation, became most supple, and any change in rhythm or time could be readily made when a setting was required for some recent political or social squib.

Later on, when Paris became the assured throne of the consolidated kingdom, and the royal court there assumed authority in matters of art and fashion, this was the centre from which were disseminated all novelties and innovations. Endorsed by the capital, any idea or mode would be certain of influence throughout the provinces and burghs of the land. The special channel of radiation was then, as now, trade, and the large fairs held at Paris furnished the means of intercourse and exchange.

The spot where the St. Germain market is now held was in olden times the focus of gayety in the town. Inaugurated in the days of Philip Augustus, this fair, which lasted from February until Easter, was a constant attraction for the burghers, and a source of diversion for the finer folk of the court. Booths were spread on every hand for the exhibition of curious wares and costly products of foreign lands. Rare embroideries from Persia, exquisite Venetian glass, filmy silks, cobwebs of delicate lace, and sinister blades of Damascus dazzled the eye and bewildered the judgment. Here was to be seen the intricate workmanship of Italian goldsmiths, or perchance a piece of finely decorated silver wrought by the cunning hand of a Cellini, while near by precious stones flashed back the sunlight, or mimicked the glare of the torches. Farther on, a fortune teller in sombre sable sent shivers of awe through his audience, or an importunate bell summoned the loiterers to a dramatic performance in which acts and words none of the purest, evoked uncontrollable laughter. Here tumblers twisted themselves into strange figures, dancers pirouetted and whirled giddily on their toes, and tight



rope performers challenged applause by their dexterity. Harlequin and Columbine glided through their pantomime, and jugglers dazed the imagination by their marvellous feats. During the day, trade was briskly carried on, but with the magic of torchlight the place became a bewildering fairy land. Titled lords and ladies might be seen glittering in satin and cloth of gold; loud laughter and gay songs echoed through the corridors; and boisterous words frequently carrying bloodshed in their train, might be heard above the general murmur of voices. It was a constant carnival of mirth, gorgeousness, and orgies indescribable, a scene of unbridled license and wantonness, where anything that could amuse would gain instant recognition.

Across the river, beyond the church of St. Laurent, on the ground now occupied by the *Chemin de fer de l'Est*, was a smaller market known by the name of the sacred edifice near which it was held. This was too distant to be frequented by the city people, and till the time of Louis XIV it was given over to the country folk who, during the months of August and September, came hither to lay in their supply of earthenware and china. In the reign of the Grand Monarch, however, it took a step forward and almost rivalled its brilliant sister.

At these two great successive cosmopolitan gatherings, theatrical entertainments were popular in the extreme. The benches would be crowded with eager sightseers, whether it were to watch the lifelike puppets of a cleverly manœuvred show, or to applaud the graceful posing of some foreign star. The fame of these entertainments, in certain instances, reached the royal ears, and special performances would be commanded before the court. Countenanced in this manner by the first tribunal of taste in the land, the companies of the fair became the fashion, and, as the seventeenth century drew to a close, impinging upon the prerogatives of the Grand Opera.

The latter species of entertainment had been inaugurated under the Italian Lulli, and the quick jealousy of the musician took alarm. Were the musical performances of the magnificent *Palais Royal*, produced with all the accessories of orchestra and ballet to be

slighted for a miserable show of itinerant players? Influenced by the representations of the intolerant master, the king forbade vagrant actors the use of singing or dancing, restricting them to puppets, tumbling and pantomime. The dignified dame, now known as the *Comédie Française* had also had occasion to complain bitterly of these impertinent upstarts filching plays that were her peculiar property, and it was with extreme satisfaction that she saw this check applied to their pretensions.

The Opera in France is an exotic. From the beginning of the renaissance several attempts were made to transplant the drama of Italy to the Parisian stage. Henry the Third yielding to the dominant influence of his time invited to Blois a celebrated Florentine troupe under the direction of Flaminio Scala and made persistent attempts to thwart the opposition of parliament and establish them permanently in his kingdom, but the death of their patron, and subsequently political disturbances ruined the venture. The stalwart, amorous son of Jeanne d'Albret, in the latter part of his reign, again favored such an enterprise, possibly to draw off the jealous attention of his Italian spouse from the royal gallantries, and again the undertaking failed. From this time little more is heard of the Italian drama till the brilliant days of Louis the Fourteenth. The Cardinal lover of Anne of Austria sought to divert his troublesome young sovereign from affairs of state by enlisting his interest in æsthetic matters. Passionately devoted to art himself, he quite unintentionally inculcated in his royal charge a love of music allied to scenic representation, and developed a taste which bore splendid fruit later on when Mazarin's cunning brain had returned to dust.

Meanwhile the adaptation of musical form had assumed appreciable proportions on its native soil, and now when it appears in a foreign land there is a distinct suggestion of its modern tone. The first approach to genuine opera in France was seen in *La Folle Supposée* given at the *Théâtre du Petit Bourbon* in 1645. Most of the play was spoken, to be sure, but there was a large orchestra which accompanied the singing of original airs, and led

the ballet. Musical setting, however, was not considered an organic part of the performance. It was extraneous to the main interest, and was used merely as an embellishment, or as a means of appeal to the restless tastes of the French people. There was also elaborate stage machinery.

The success of this new departure was quickly felt, and reflected in the literature of the stage, both in the style of the productions and in the regulation of form to the ruling craze. Corneille deigned to avail himself of the vulgar fancy for intricate stage mechanism, and Molière with his subtle sense adjusted himself without delay to the popular point of view. *Le Mariage Forcé*, *La Princesse*, and *Le Sicilien* approached extremely near to the province of the modern *Opéra Comique*; too near, in fact, as events shortly proved.

Again Lulli stands forth as the jealous guardian of his precious exotic. The nursing is bravely struggling into independent life and every breath that blows upon it must be carefully tempered. To check what might prove a dangerous ambition, the king, persuaded by Lulli, compelled Molière to cut down the number of his company, and withdraw from a competition which would have proved disastrous to the favored plaything of the hour. Molière yielded perforce, though his future relations with the Italian appeared strained. The connection hitherto existing between them was severed, and the composer turned to Philip Quinault, the baker's son, as his future collaborator, declining the proffered services of La Fontaine as quite impracticable.

Before this discouragement of his efforts, however, Molière had made important strides toward an end which he did not himself realize. By the introduction of singing after the dances, by the use of rhythmic prose, by connecting the isolated scenes with a definite plot, he paved the way for his successors, while by the wit, gayety, and merry feeling of his couplets he set a standard which pointed directly toward the result of future years. Who now was to inherit the work so successfully inaugurated by Molière and unconsciously to develop this peculiar genre? Was it Lulli and Quinault, in their Grand Opera at the

*Palais Royal*, successful and prosperous in the sunlight of courtly patronage? Was it the native French comedians of the *Hotel Gueugaud*, the natural heirs of their great countryman? Or was it the Italian company of the *Hotel Bourgogne*, which was attracting the people by its coarsely clever performances?

Lulli had been forbidden to make use of Molière's peculiar kind of work. The French comedians were restrained by a similar royal injunction in favor of Lulli. So the Italian company assumed his repertory, and with the quick perception of inherited culture pushed forward the incipient type that had fallen into their hands until it became *Comédie Vaudeville*, the precursor of *Opéra Comique*. In the plays thus produced, prose was used for ordinary passages, verse for scenes of elevated feeling, familiar melodies, or *vaudevilles*, for ridicule and uproarious gayety, and original airs, for the expression of tenderness, or the exhibition of the soloists' voices. The object always distinctly kept in view was to promote laughter by means of mingled songs and dialogue. Extreme indulgence had all along been shown to this foreign troupe, as to a spoiled child, and their performances gradually became quite unrestrained. The language used was coarse, even indecent, and the acting and dancing shockingly licentious; but they presumed one point too far, when in 1697 a new play was announced called *La Fausse Prude*, and the insult to Mme de Maintenon recoiled upon them. The *Comédie Italienne* was banished from Paris for a score of years in spite of the prayers and entreaties of its admirers.

Again the *Comédie mêlée de chant* seems abandoned, but in reality it only suffers eclipse for a season, to appear directly under native auspices and thence expand into an expression of national life.

In the fairs of St. Germain and St. Laurent already mentioned, this form of drama finds a congenial and effective stage. At the former there were just now three theatres, and all of them with one consent quietly adopted the material of the disgraced Italian company. Paris smiled, and flocked to participate in the amusement so dear to its frivolous soul. Once more the *Comédie Française* viewed with



alarm the success of these popular attractions. Although protected by government, she saw with dismay her audiences dwindling and the receipts shrinking to a most disquieting figure. So an injunction was again obtained against the theatres of the fairs, forbidding them any utterance whatsoever on the stage, or the production of any dramatic exhibition spoken or sung. Then followed a period of incessant plot and counterplot, a time of quibbling evasion and deceit; passion was roused, and violence restored to. All Paris took sides in the quarrel.

Obliged finally to yield to its powerful opponent, the *Théâtre de la Foire* found itself definitely restrained to dumb show. But here the public came in, and as usual eventually turned the quarrel in the direction of its own gratification. In order to elucidate certain scenes, unintelligible it was complained when rendered by gesture alone, the plan was adopted of writing out the explanation in large characters and displaying it at the appropriate moment. But French felicity took offence at the awkwardness of this procedure, and the scheme was then tried of throwing these interpretations into couplets arranged to some pertinent *vaudeville*. These were played by the orchestra, while persons hired for the occasion, and placed in different parts of the house, caught up the air lustily, and sang the explanatory rhymes. The success of this venture was triumphant. The whole audience grasped the situation and joined in with enthusiastic satisfaction. The *Comédie Française* had driven the actors of the fair out of the domaine of dialogue and spoken parts; the Grand Opera, actuated by similar antagonism, had forbidden them arias and original musical settings so the *Opéra Comique* was crushed back again, while, as her precursor, the *Opéra Vaudeville* assumed a definite position on the French stage, and became highly popular.

Let us consider now the character of this sort of operatic entertainment, which held the fancy of the Parisians for more than half a century. We first detect its existence in the couplets already noted, which were sung by spectators to popular airs, and acted in pantomime by performers on the stage. At first

these couplets were badly constructed and few in number, but they gradually improved in quality and their use became more frequent. The moral tone of the whole work was exceedingly questionable. The language was satirical and indecent, pointed by broad buffoonery. Measures of national policy and social usages were subjects for comment or ridicule, and no little influence was exerted in this way upon the tone of public feeling. In proof of the popularity of this new opera, we find the *Comédie Française* lowering her rigid standard, and introducing upon her stage the prime attractions of the *vaudeville* song and dance.

The religious devotion of Louis the Fourteenth in his later years did not affect the manners of his people at large, nor even of his nobles except while at court. The *petites maisons*, soon to become notorious, were already endorsed by such names as the Prince de Conti, the Duc de Vendôme, and the Duc d'Orléans with his beautiful bad daughter, the Duchesse de Berry, and theatrical entertainments catered only too successfully to a taste at once meretricious and depraved.

Chiefly instrumental in the future development of the *Opéra Vaudeville*, according to our author, were Le Sage, Fuselier, and Dorneval. Fuselier was the pioneer in compositions of this sort, and his efforts and failures contained valuable lessons to his colleagues. For a score of years, these three men labored together, but their work was not the outcome of any literary impulse. Necessity called it forth, and it had the hireling stamp upon it. The fame of Le Sage was secured by *Gil Blas*, not by his writings for the theatre; nevertheless, an important advance had been made in musical comedy during his time, and the designation, *Opéra Comique*, as applied to the *vaudeville* productions was now first heard. By a concession from the Grand Opera the performers themselves were allowed to sing their airs; the couplets were connected by prose, thereby securing consistency and clearness, and on the whole there was a rise in literary standard and an improvement in dramatic construction. Le Sage and his co-workers took the shapeless mass left by the *Comédie Italienne* and moulded it into form, endow-



ing it with virility and an informing spirit. The attitude of the public never wavered; there was quick response to the *double entendre* of the familiar songs and never-ending delight in the simple music and graceful posing of the ballet. The death of Le Sage seems to conclude the first tangible epoch in the history of the *Opéra Comique* as related by M. Font.

In advancing from this point, we are at once impressed with the decided improvement of the moral tone of the comic stage, as indeed of all artistic expression. More than a century before, a reaction had set in at the Hôtel de Rambouillet against the gallantry and grossness of the Renaissance, and this breath of purity was gradually reviving the sick soul of France. Hitherto natural emotion had been stifled, and real sentiment chilled by scepticism and debauchery: to ridicule simplicity and ingenuousness in manners or art was the fashion, and all manifestations of spiritual life were met with derision and satire. Ennui arising from this decay of the ideal reigned supreme, and in consequence there came a revulsion toward artlessness and well-doing; the theatres promptly registered this new attitude and a total change is noticed on the playbills. Panard, the allegorist, was the apostle of the new period; his plays show virtue triumphant, and the sentimental moral at the close is always distinctly formulated. The charm of his work consists in the humor and goodness with which he observes the world, and the grace of his comments. He was clever in versification, ready in wit, fertile in resource, and strong enough of hand to pass on the torch to Favart who was to light therefrom the brilliant flame of a recognized form of French drama.

It was through most modest by-ways that the fair hand-maid of Euterpe reached her throne among the French people. Lulli was scullion in the kitchen of Mme de Montpensier; Favart was pastry cook in the Rue de la Verrerie. As a child the latter's talents were realized by fond parents, and he had the advantage of a course at the Collège Louis-le-Grand, whence he was recalled from a career already promising, by his father's death. The young man assumed the family cares

with a sigh, and beguiled his leisure by writing plays for the *Opéra Vaudeville* to which diversion he was predisposed by an early musical training from his father. His work attracted the attention of the manager of the theatre, and though he wrote anonymously he soon had the gratification of seeing his efforts recognized. According to our author, Favart's dramatic career is to be divided into three periods. From 1734 to 1740 may be called a time of probation, during which his ability was tested by no fewer than eighteen plays, most of them written in conjunction with Panard, Fagin, and others. The next twenty years witnessed the expansion of his originality and the exercise of his full powers. During this time he composed his best comedies in *vaudevilles* and *ariettas*, and several pastorals and pantomimes. *La Chercheuse d'Esprit* passed through two hundred successive representations, touching with new life the inanimate stage, and apprizing the author of his strongest bent. Stirred by this success, the theatre St. Germain broke through its fossilized ways, and set about improving its administration. In addition to his rights as author, Favart was subsidized to lend his aid to the fresh enterprises, among which was accuracy and appropriateness of costume, an innovation which took all Paris by storm. The *Comédies Françaises* and *Italienne*, were deserted, and, in revengful self-defence, they succeeded in having the *Opéra Comique* suppressed.

This was a severe blow to the poet; it meant to him the difference between four thousand livres a year and nothing; but for this loss he was largely consoled by his bewitching girl-wife whom he had recently married from the boards. Moreover, his fortunes were somewhat mended by an invitation from Marshal Saxe to assume entire direction of a dramatic troupe, which was to accompany the army to Brussels. This connection with the licentious warrior may be passed over hurriedly, as little creditable; it finally drove Favart into exile, and rendered his wife nearly desperate by a series of exasperating persecutions which terminated only with the death of the amorous old dotard. The husband and wife were reunited at Paris, and he became

temporarily associated with the *Théâtre Italien*. The city, however, was clamoring for the reestablishment of its old favorite, and soon the Favart family were able to assume their former position in the *Opéra Comique*.

A great convulsion brought about by an apparently unimportant incident now seized the operatic world in Paris. A traveling Italian company had sung the *Serva Padrona*, by Pergolese, at the Academy to an enthusiastic audience, and the question at once arose whether it were not possible to sing French words to original airs. The dilettante, Jean Jacques Rousseau, said it was out of the question, but the director of the *Opéra Comique* made the attempt, and Mme Favart appeared in the title role amid great applause; this was the knell of the *Opéra Vaudeville*. The old repertory failed to please, and Favart's fresh attempts along the new line met with no adverse criticism. When the entire management of the theatre soon after fell into his hands he was so patronized that the *Comédie Italienne* proposed a consolidation with its ruinous rival. The *Opéra Comique* had driven the Italian vogue from its own stage and supplanted it in its own domain.

Favart's reputation was now at its height. His opinion was considered final in all questions of dramatic art, and he was employed by the court of Vienna with a liberal emolument as final referee in matters of theatrical custom.

The last period of his life marks the decline from this brilliant apogee. His work was less independent and consisted largely in the mere writing of librettos. Just here comes in the Abbé Voisenon, a hideous abortion aspiring to be a literary star; his vanity was extreme, and he had assumed a position of authority altogether unsupported by real merit. To this man Favart submitted his plays for advice and correction, and ere long the report became current that the Abbé was their real author: a cursory comparison however of the style of the two men must dismiss any such statement as an ignorant and ill-natured slander. The definite attraction to the conceited churchman in this intercourse was undoubtedly the dramatist's pretty wife, a fact proved by his excessive grief at her death, and the

costly monument he erected to her memory. Favart's work was about over. The fickle taste of the Parisian public had taken another leap, and he was too old to follow. The *Comédie* with *ariettas* was the favorite of the hour, and Sedaine was its expounder. In 1780 the *Opéra Comique*, alias the *Comédie Italienne*, left the *Hôtel de Bourgogne* and occupied new quarters in the garden of the *Hôtel de Choiseul* called the *Salle Favart*, and here many an ovation was accorded the aged playwright before the stormy days of the revolution closed over Paris. Finally he retired to his villa at Belleville and died at the ripe old age of eighty-two years, in 1792.

About a hundred pages of the work before us is devoted to a consideration of Favart's *dramatis personae*, and his method of composition. The subject, perhaps, does not admit of any specially fine criticism, but it is handled carefully, with great attention to detail, and copious illustration. I shall briefly summarize the observations made.

Favart produced some sixty *vaudevilles*, and in this style of work he was unsurpassed. His *dramatis personae* (one can scarcely call them characters) are mainly country folk and innocents, and a sort of puerile love his unvarying theme. His art consists in depicting situations controlled by this passion, and in revealing absurd predicaments induced by the naïve wantonness of the lovers. These are the creations of his own imagination, and he uses them untiringly; he has no care to depict truth or reveal nature, his sole object being to amuse. The woman of his plays is invariably beautiful, presumably as an indemnity for her inane simplicity; she knows nothing of the world or of herself. The hero is equally ignorant; he has never even heard of marriage, and recommends his mistress to his rival. They are as devoid of shame as our first parents, and in critical moments present an appearance of astonished curiosity only.

Jeannot meets Jeannette at a fair; he gives her a bouquet and they both become bewitched. The interest consists in the attempts of the pair to break the enchantment; they consult the birds and beasts on the best means of effecting a cure; they leap like kids, dance, and chase each other like kittens, but all in



vain. The sheep sleeping suggests a remedy, so they imitate the example set them, but no alleviation of their disease follows; they are still more restless than before; they join hands, then let go; then Jeannot tries the plan of kissing Jeannette's hand; this seems to afford temporary relief; they are both pleased and smile with gratification. It is perhaps possible that a complete cure may be effected by an embrace, and we leave them with this anticipation. The characteristics are the same in all the plays: a pair of idiotic people who show the same incomprehensible ignorance and lack of *savoir faire*.

In dramatic construction Favart may be said to be exceedingly clever; his actors speak clearly and without circumlocution; the drift of the story can be usually inferred from the first scene, and in case of any misunderstanding he avails himself of a monologue. An explanation of exits and entrances is not always at hand, but as these are invariably arranged at the right moment their awkwardness is forgiven. His dramatic sense is admirable; the stage-settings are carefully considered, and, as already mentioned, accuracy of costume was minutely regulated. To intensify the illusion of local color, he would place at times appropriate solecisms in the mouth of his peasants, not for the sake of truth to nature, but solely to produce effect.

In regard to the choice of *vaudeville* airs, and use of the couplet, Favart showed himself singularly skillful. The latter was employed to express fear, joy, sorrow, jealousy, or extremes of tender feeling. It is also found gilding equivocal parts, when too broad situations might cause displeasure, or is found encasing some racy anecdote. Prose suffices for the short transition speeches, for insignificant detail, and the like subordinate offices. As to his *vaudevilles*: in his pantomimes, the accompaniment was entirely of these airs, and consequently charged with an ulterior meaning. The older music which had been in constant service for years on the Pont Neuf was decidedly broad in its suggestions; Le Sage used to say these songs were a very menace to modesty. A *double entendre* arose through this adaptation, and certain of them in consequence invariably provoked lewd associations.

The addition of melody, however, seemed to varnish over vulgarity, and add the quota of refinement necessary to make it palatable to a Parisian. The author would veil his meaning under an analogous idea, and flatter his audience by leaving the discovery of the relation to their ingenuity. His work abounds in this kind of duplex meaning. The sentimental plays characteristic of his last period, however, show fewer examples of this peculiarity, though delicate situations still appear.

Favart's attitude toward the last phase of *Opéra Comique* is somewhat perplexing. He was one of the first to countenance the novelty at the *Comédie Italienne*, and had prepared the ground previously by adopting newer and more elaborate airs in his *vaudeville* plays. Yet once the new style inaugurated, he clung tenaciously to old forms, as he found it very difficult to readjust the habits of a lifetime. Where he signally failed in these later attempts is in the delineation of strong emotion: he was neither hot nor cold and so pleased no one; he strove to attract by an emasculation of the old-times wiles, and so lost the Gaelic salt with no substitute of soul-stirring emotion. His verses grew cold, and he could not fill with an inflated affectation the void occasioned by the absence of pure feeling.

At the conclusion of an elaborate dissertation such as Mr. Font has produced, a work consisting of three hundred and fifty large octavo printed pages, and representing close investigation, and much labor, the reader naturally sums up in his mind the results of the effort, and questions the *value* of the addition to the stock of literary knowledge arising from these pains.

It is hardly possible to regard the *Opéra Comique* as a literary development. From the librettist there is demanded a sense of dramatic fitness, and skill in versification; but success does not require the subtle touch of the artist, nor a soul instinct with a sense of things invisible. Favart was not an artist, nor a poet, simply a clever craftsman; the origin of that type of stage art to which he devoted himself was due to the craving of a light-minded people for novelty, and its continuation and final definite recognition may be ascribed to the same demand for frivolous



diversion. There was no call here for able employment of style and no opportunity for elevated expression; the musical setting hindered any attempt at noble creation.

The interest, then, which would centre around a work of this sort must be excited by its connection with national life and social evolution, as an index to the trend of popular inclination and the intellectual cast. Regarded in this light it assumes a rational relation to other forms of expression in which a nation records its changing taste and growing culture, but its proper ratio to the general concrete disclosure of the spirit of the time ought to be diligently guarded. If however by chance or misfortune, some single phenomenon becomes unduly prominent in the mind of a writer, the proportion is disturbed and the thing itself assumes a distorted shape. So with this treatise before us.

After the glamour of the author's evident admiration for his subject has been lifted, and the innumerable details brushed aside, we may resolve the matter into the following residuum.

Favart was an amiable, practical man, with feeble mental independence, possessing no small dramatic ability, and a happy knack at turning a couplet to suit a given tune. Beyond this, as far as I can see, he did not go—could not go, as we see by his failures to please in the latter part of his life. He was not the man to inaugurate a new thing; he took a special inheritance, and employed it to the best advantage, cleverly, but with little originality and with no literary feeling. The gifts entrusted to him he used to good purpose, but they were only the one talent.

In view of the rather meagre results deduced from the painstaking research of M. Font, we are constrained to wish that the learned Doctor had turned his attention to a more fruitful field, and expended his labor on some more inspiring subject.

PHILLIP OGDEN.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

#### OLD ENGLISH.

*Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen*, von Dr. J. Ernst Wülfig. Erster Teil. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1894. 8vo, xxix, 491 pp.

SINCE the year 1878, there has been issuing from the German universities an almost steady flow of monographs dealing with questions of Old-English Syntax. Before that date a few isolated papers in this field had seen the light, of which, perhaps, the most important was Lichtenheld's article, "Das Schwache Adjectiv im Angelsächsischen," published in Haupt's *Zeitschrift* for 1873. But these were few, and far between: since the date mentioned, more than fifty dissertations and important articles have appeared, and in the past decade no year has seen the publication of less than three. The larger number of these have emanated from Leipzig, which has sent forth twenty dissertations, under the stimulus of Wülcker and Sievers. Our own country has produced three, all of a high grade of excellence, and all prepared at Johns Hopkins under the direction of Prof. Bright. The American dissertations are marked by a breadth of view, a sanity of judgment, and a strong individuality of treatment, quite rare in similar German productions.

But, steady as this flow has been, and valuable as we may consider its results, the past twenty-five years have brought us little nearer to the complete treatise on Old-English Syntax which has been so much longed for. Koch and Mätzner, in their general grammars, give fairly adequate consideration to the salient points of the subject, but the matter is so scattered about in their volumes as not to be easily accessible; moreover, their knowledge of the literature was not exhaustive, and their statements are liable to contradiction by the discovery of a few non-conforming cases, in some text with which they were not familiar. There are black swans in almost every field of research. Occasional rare usages are not noticed by them (though a few have been added by Zupitza, in the second edition of Koch). March's grammar, while superior to these German works in point of convenience and fulness, has its value impaired by the author's failure to regard Anglo-Saxon as a stage of the English language, and by his familiarity with Latin grammar, which influenced his classification. All these books are now at least a quarter of a century old; during this period, the science has made large advances

in respect of both method and results. Dr. Kellner's excellent *Historical Outlines* (1892), while presenting, in the light of recent investigation, much that is of interest, fails to cover the whole field in a systematic way: it is rather a note-book, dealing mainly with the unusual and idiomatic in our language, than a complete treatise on English Syntax.

The subject of this review is the first published attempt at an exhaustive examination of the syntax of any considerable number of related Old-English texts. In 1888, there appeared at Bonn a "Darstellung der Syntax in König Alfred's Uebersetzung von Gregor's des Grossen *Cura Pastoralis*: Erste Hälfte," a dissertation, by J. Ernst Wülffing, in the introduction to which the author promised to publish at an early date the rest of his material on the *Cura Pastoralis*, together with similar facts on the syntax of Alfred's other writings (*Bede*, *Orosius*, and *Boethius*). The dissertation showed ability, and the promise was a welcome sound. In August, 1894, the first half of the completed work appeared, and the second half, for which the material is already collected, will, it is to be hoped, soon follow.

The long delay of six years has been turned to good account by Dr. Wülffing: he has extended his investigation to all the prose writings attributed to Alfred, so that his work gives a complete view of the syntax of Alfred's Laws and his preface to Werfrith's rendering of Gregory's *Dialogues*, and that of the translations of Augustine's *Soliloquies* and the first fifty *Psalms*, as well as of the four greater works mentioned above, a body of Old-English prose—and to the prose we must turn first for the facts of syntax—rivalled in bulk and importance only by the writings of Ælfric.

In his introduction, Wülffing gives his reasons for undertaking this work, and discusses briefly the authenticity of the various writings attributed to Alfred, and other questions connected with their composition.

An excellent table of contents follows, giving a detailed classification of the subject-matter of the book, with the section or group of sections devoted to each topic or sub-topic, and the pages on which it is to be found. A

careful examination of this table would well repay any student, especially if he is about publishing; I have seldom, if ever, seen a better in a work of this sort. It is made with as great pains as if it alone had been an end; it is a careful, detailed report of an investigation into the contents of the book. And this is only a sample of what is everywhere prominent, not only here but in the author's many critical utterances in *Englische Studien*: his high appreciation of matters of mechanical detail in book-making; almost nothing which could conduce to render his work serviceable has been neglected. This is a trait which is none too common among German scholars. To mention two other points: the section-numbers are carried along at the top of every page, and the beginning of each new section is noted in the margin. Best of all, he makes a judicious use of various fonts of type, employing italics for German, Roman type for all quotations (of Old English, Latin or English), and heavy-faced type, a little larger than 'Clarendon,' for head-words, in lists of verbs, etc., and for the names of Alfred's works. This gives the book an 'Uebersichtlichkeit' which is rare, even among the people from whom we are compelled to borrow the word.

The table of contents is followed by a list of texts and translations of Alfred's writings, and a very good bibliography of works bearing on Old-English Syntax completes the introductory matter. This, while not exhaustive, is far better and fuller than of any other known to me.

The book deals with the Syntax of the Noun, Article, Adjective, Numeral and Pronoun. The first 275 pages are occupied with the treatment of the six cases of nouns; this does not include their use after prepositions, but consists largely of an exhaustive account of their employment after verbs.

There are occasional slight inconsistencies in the arrangement of the matter, as when, for instance, after giving eighteen short sections to verbs which take the genitive and dative, or genitive and accusative, which he has classified on the same lines as those which take the genitive only, he masses all the verbs followed by the dative and accusa-



tive, which are more than twice as numerous as the classes just mentioned, in one large section, arranging them alphabetically. The great army of verbs with the accusative, filling nearly one hundred and eighteen pages, are arranged alphabetically, and divided into twenty-two sections, one for each initial letter; the reader wonders just what, in a book where every device of arrangement has its purpose, was the object of this arbitrary division.

If Wülfing regards the adnominal use of the genitive as the original one, he does not show it by his arrangement, in which this construction is treated *after* the same case with adjectives, comparatives and verbs; in fact, he seems to have made little attempt to place phenomena in the order of their probable development. And this brings me to the greatest defect of the book,—the absence of philosophical treatment of the facts of syntax.

A recent critic says, 'there is no doubt that the German plan of starting theories, right or wrong, and of considering him a poor and unprofitable scholar who has no new theories to offer, has been the cause of a great advance in scholarship.' But one of Wülfing's marked characteristics is his extreme caution. He is slow to make any generalizations or state any theories of his own. At the head of each main section, he gives a bibliography of the special topic to be considered, and refers the reader to the works there cited for all discussion of the nature and history of the phenomena under view. Besides the monographs, he continually cites the sections of Grimm and Erdmann (*Syntax der Sprache Otfrids*) for matter of this sort; but we look in vain for a definite statement of his allegiance to any one of these authorities. He quotes Erdmann most often, but even him he does not follow consistently, as on page 11, where he says that the genitive after verbs is often the representative of other cases. He does not commit himself at all in these general matters; indeed, he seems to care little about them, and to say, 'If you want theory or explanation, you will find it in such and such a place; my only interest is in collecting facts.' Except in a few rare instances, his statements are of the briefest; as, 'The adverbial geni-

tive denotes the time, place or manner of an action,' reminding us of the 'rules of Syntax' in an old school-grammar of Latin. This confinement of the view to the phenomena sometimes leads to rather amusing results, as where he introduces section after section with the statement, 'This is a real, or pure, or genuine, or actual dative,' while leaving us entirely in the dark in regard to his views on the nature of that case. Perhaps Wülfing agrees with the view expressed by Behaghel, in 1876 (*Die Modi im Heliand*), that we can arrive at no satisfactory explanations of syntactical facts, except on the basis of a general Germanic syntax, for which immense collections will be required; however, his work would be much more useful to all but specialists in this field, if he gave an outline of the theories most widely accepted, or at least a distinct statement of the authority with whose views the writer agrees.

But, though we may wish he had been a little less cautious in this regard, we cannot but be grateful for the same spirit of caution and exactness as exhibited in other directions. He is very careful not to make or accept any deductions based on ambiguous forms, or to make statements, except of fact, for which he has not authorities, and of these he cites as many as possible; as, for instance, on pp. 420 f., where he gives the opinions of thirteen men on the ellipsis of the relative pronoun, and concludes by saying that he does not and cannot know whether such a thing exists, until all the material is obtained. He thinks there may be three cases in Alfred (*Bede* 491, 22; *Boethius* 290, 9; *Soliloquies* 182, 31). On pp. 416 f., he quotes eighteen men on *pāra þe* with a singular verb; here he violates his customary neutrality, and gives his own opinion in the matter: that *pāra* originally belonged to the principal clause, and served to remove obscurity by repeating, immediately before the relative pronoun, the idea on which that pronoun was dependent. Gradually the force of this *pāra* of repetition ceased to be felt, and it became connected with *þe* in a merely formal way, and so used even when there was nothing to repeat. Finally, as a result of this loss of meaning, the plural of the verb became singular, whenever the idea to which



(*pāra*) *þe* related was singular. He frequently refers to Grein, Sievers, and Cosijn, concerning matters of form. In one place (p. 40) he quotes a private note from Professor Toller.

His original contributions to the book (aside from the occasional digressions, which are sometimes rather diverting; as, where he spends two pages (73 f.) in proving to an unbeliever that Alfred knew Latin, and was a good translator) consist largely of corrections of the statements and views of previous writers. Thus, he gives new meanings for words not found in Bosworth-Toller (as, *æmanne*, p. 3); corrects the interpretations and punctuations of the editors and translators (as, p. 7 § 6 a; p. 417 top); and suggests frequent emendations of the text, not always wisely; as, when (p. 22) he proposes to change *ys* (*Soliloquies* 169, 30) to *hys*, and treat this as a genitive after *lucuman*, which everywhere else takes a dative, as do all the other forty-seven verbs compounded with *tō-*. He frequently quotes usages in other texts, on the authority of the dissertation-makers, to support his readings; as, at the foot of p. 7.

It is, however, primarily as a collector of facts that Wülfing has chosen to come before the world, and in this capacity he is well-nigh ideal. He claims—and the claim seems to be well founded—that his lists of the occurrences of all but the most simple constructions are exhaustive, and a large number of examples are given in full; at least one instance of every construction is so given. Of some of the more common and unchanging usages; as, the nominative case of subject, or the accusative after verbs like *habban*, he gives only a few examples, and denotes the relative frequency of the form by annexing one or more *u. s. w*'s.

No pains are spared to make this body of facts available to the student. Copious and exact cross-references are given; uncommon or unique usages are mentioned as such; under each construction, there follows a list of the other forms for expressing the same relation or idea, with reference, to the sections where they are treated in full; and a careful distinction is made between varying uses of the same verb with different meanings (as *scūfan*, p. 23). At the end of the book are two

very useful tables (the familiar 'Rektion' of the dissertations), in one of which are found the adjectives used by Alfred with a case after them, in the other, the verbs. These are arranged alphabetically, and the case or cases which follow them, are denoted by their initial letters, with references to the sections where they are discussed. When we consider that half a page or more is often consumed in the account of a single word in the text (as, *wyrðe* with the genitive, *bebēodan* with the dative, *begangan* with the accusative), the value of these tables becomes more apparent. In fact, the amount of space devoted to the treatment of these cases, especially the one hundred and eighteen pages given to the accusative after the many transitive verbs, a construction which is in most instances so familiar and simple as to need only the merest mention, suggests that, in common with so many of his countrymen, Dr. Wülfing perhaps lacks that sense of proportion which alone can form a bundle of dry facts into a work of art.

Wherever possible, Wülfing has used the work already done by other scholars. He seems to have a high admiration for Dr. Callaway's dissertation on the Absolute Participle. He devotes three pages (145-148) to a detailed synopsis of its contents, section by section, an honor which he grants to no other monograph. He makes some comments, and adds four cases (*Bede* 543, 1; 570, 7; 601, 20; preface to *Dialogues*, 68).

He bases his treatment of the article on Philipsen and Hüllweck, with some slight additions, as the inclusion of *sum*, under the indefinite article. His investigation of the adjective is confined to a comparison of the uses of the strong and weak forms, along the lines first drawn by Lichtenheld. He builds on Bock in discussing the pronoun, and on Bock and Fricke for the numeral.

His treatment of the use of the singular and plural of substantives (pp. 275 ff.) is of interest. Here he discusses *neofon* and *heofonas*, and the use of *brēost*, *hēafod*, *meolc*, and other words, in the plural, with singular meaning.

He treats the important question of word-position, in his various sections (as, that of the attributive genitive, pp. 49 ff.); this branch of

syntax has been sadly neglected by previous writers. The most important contribution to our knowledge of the subject is Dr. C. Alphonso Smith's Johns Hopkins dissertation, published in 1893, with which Wülfing seems to be unacquainted.

The book, as will be seen, has some faults, one of which, the absence of general philosophical statements regarding the history and nature of the phenomena, will prevent its taking its place, even temporarily, as a handbook of Old-English Syntax for general use. But, as a treasury of syntactical facts, a storehouse of excellently classified examples, it is deserving of the highest praise. No work at all comparable to it in value, making use, as it does, of the often inaccessible results obtained by other scholars during the past twenty-five years, has yet appeared. Dr. Wülfing's patience and care, and the wisdom shown in making his book serviceable by mechanical devices, must win for him the thanks of students of Old English everywhere; and all must recognize 'The Syntax in the Works of Alfred the Great,' as the most important contribution, as regards both bulk and thoroughness, yet made towards the general treatise of the future, for which a hand is yet to be found.

FRANK H. CHASE.

Yale University.

### HISTORY OF THE NOVEL.

*A History of the Novel Previous to the Seventeenth Century.* By F. M. WARREN, Professor in Adelbert College of Western Reserve University. Cloth, 8vo, 361 pp. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1895.

THIS is preëminently an age of novel-writing and novel-reading. Prose fiction is the literary form in which the history and culture, the thought and life of the times are being crystallized, to which the best literary talent is being devoted, and which is attracting the widest interest. The systematic study of fiction is coming more and more into vogue. Under such circumstances, Professor Warren's history of the early novel is indeed a most timely book. The great novel-reading public will, of course, have little time and less taste for such

a scientific treatise, but students will welcome it and, for three special reasons, will find it of interest and value.

In the first place, it has to do with the beginnings of what has become the best product of modern literature, giving a careful and extended account of that early growth which, from the scientific standpoint, is so essential to an understanding of the character and tendencies of the modern novel. In the second place, it is a study in comparative literature and, as such, of great value for its comprehensive treatment. Again, it is almost the only book in its field. In English, Dunlop's *History of Fiction* is no longer up to date, and in French and German, scholars have never taken up the subject as a whole, but have contented themselves rather with monographs on some of its various phases. Other kinds of literature have been treated systematically and scientifically, but not until now have we had such a history of the novel.

Availing himself of the results of the most recent investigations, Professor Warren takes up the origin and growth, in classic and mediæval literatures, of the several classes of the novel, discussing for each the impulses that produced it, the elements that composed it, and the conditions that fostered its influence or, in turn, induced its decline.

At the outset the author very properly considers it necessary "to determine what a novel is, and how it differs from other kinds of fiction." After giving the origin and history of the terms in use, he distinguishes the novel from other types of fiction by assigning to it the essential characteristic of a well-defined plot. On this point there is general agreement, but many will not accept the statement that "there is, in fact, no difference in quality between the prose story and the novel. It is merely a difference in size, the novel being the larger." Though it is, in practice, often difficult to say whether a book is a story or a novel, there is, theoretically and strictly speaking, a difference in quality as well as in quantity. The genuine story has different themes, different objects in view, different methods, and a different kind of characters. On this point compare the generally accepted difference between the German *Novelle* and *Ro-*

man, as emphasized by Gervinust and Spielhagen.<sup>2</sup>

Following an excellent short account of "the place of the novel" in the literatures of Europe, the succeeding chapters take up in order the several phases of the general subject—the Greek novel, the romance of chivalry, the pastoral in Italy and Spain, the Spanish *picaresco* type, the early English novel, and close with a brief mention of the few Chinese novels that have become known to us.

The oldest member, then, of the fiction family is the Greek novel, cultivated by the Sophists in the later Alexandrine age. Its earliest surviving specimen is the *Nimrod* fragment, a tale of love and adventure, dating from "at least the beginning of the first century of the Christian era" and "assimilating, in the land of Egypt, the material drawn from Oriental sources with the traditional conception of a Homeric romance." Particular attention is called to the conditions that produced it and to the social, political, and religious changes which account for the difference in spirit and tone between it and the later realistic and plebeian novels of the Sophists. Professor Warren has his own theory of the development of the Greek novel, based, no doubt, on the character of the *Nimrod* fragment and, in a very interesting and plausible argument, suggests the "analogy of the romances of chivalry" in support of his theory that such tales of love and adventure "descended from the old epic poetry through the intermediary of prose versions destined wholly for popular use." We then have the six novels of the later Greek school, five stories of erotic adventure and one, *Daphnis and Chloe*, the only pastoral handed down from antiquity. Their plots are detailed, their authorship, sources, and character are discussed, and attention is called to their general and indirect bearing upon mediaeval literature as well as to their direct influence, later, on the modern novel. The detail of these chapters is rather a virtue than a fault, and will be appreciated by the general reader, to whom such material is by no means easily accessible.

1. *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, vol. v, p. 634.

2. *Technik des Romans*, pp. 246 ff.

Passing to the romances of chivalry, the author discusses first the various forms of early French fiction—the poetic *romance*, the narrative *lai*, the *roman d'aventure*, the Breton tales, etc. The evolution of these types is given in some detail with the object of showing the part they had in the gradual development of the romances of chivalry. In the latter Professor Warren sees "a mixture of the Breton epic, in large proportion, of the national epic in small proportion, and of the *roman d'aventure*, the recipient flask." He regards it as "quite certain that they take their subject from a *romance* or a *roman d'aventure*, as well as the general features of their plot. But their substance they obtain from another kind of mediaeval poetry," namely, that "which is seen in the poems celebrating the deeds of Arthur and the Round Table, the love of Tristan, and the mystery of the Holy Grail." *Iwain* is the type of the models of the first genuine novel of modern times, *Amadis of Gaul*, which appeared in Spain at the opening of the sixteenth century, but which goes back for its source to João Lobeira and the thirteenth. To this and its successors the author then devotes considerable time, discussing their authors and their plots, their spirit and their literary qualities, their revisers and sequels, and their influence upon later productions. *Amadis* gets a good critique, which emphasizes its component elements and makes interesting comparisons with other early fiction types; for instance, with the Greek novel. The fortunes of *Amadis*, *Palmerin*, and others of his fellows, in their conquests of other literatures—French, English and German—and their fate when they fall into the hands of ecclesiastical writers are briefly, but adequately, described. In this discussion of the romances of chivalry, and in fact throughout the whole book, Professor Warren attaches great importance to the influence, upon the various fiction types, of the external circumstances which produced them and which helped or hindered their development. Especial credit is due to his frequent résumés, always in proper connection, of the social, political, moral, and material conditions which, in a given time and place, influenced the rise or the decline of these



literary types.

The next three chapters are devoted to the pastoral novel, its origin, and progress simultaneously in Italy and Spain:

"The life of the Italian pastoral shows two distinct currents, which run side by side without attempting to blend. The older and stronger is the stream of the narrative pastoral, appearing usually in prose form, while the dramatic pastoral chose poetry for the expression of its sentiments."

These two classes are described at length, the former being called "the legitimate descendant of Latin pastoral poetry, whether mediaeval or classic," while the latter is found to "resemble Greek elegiac poetry." The only two narrative pastorals of any significance, Boccaccio's *Amelo* and Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, are described in detail, emphasis being laid on their very considerable influence on foreign literatures, while to the dramatic rival, "though represented by a much larger number of masterpieces," a much smaller influence is ascribed.

In his account of the origin of the Spanish pastoral, the author decides that it was not "imitated," as has been usually held, "with some improvements in construction from the Latin neighbor to the eastward" but is "entirely indigenous to the Iberian peninsula." He traces its progress from the early *pastourelles* through the Christmas *autos*, the dramatic eclogues of Encina, the lyric narratives of Garcilaso, and the dialogues of Sã de Miranda and Ribeiro. A separate chapter is given to the greatest pastoral, Montemayor's *Diana*, and its sequels and successors, among which are Cervantes' *Galatea* and Lope's *Primavera*. Professor Warren considers *Diana* second only to *Amadis* itself in its influence on the modern novel, and sees in the *Astrée* of Honoré D'Urfé the "medium through which its novelistic elements were conveyed to our latter-day authors." Throughout these discussions of pastorals and chivalry romances there runs an undercurrent of the author's good-humored satire, which makes the otherwise very long-winded laments of these love-lorn swains much more endurable.

It is certainly remarkable that the same country and the same century that brought forth

the progenitors of idealistic fiction, should have produced the first genuine realistic novel as well. Yet such is the case. The same sixteenth-century Spain, of which we have been reading, gave us the beginnings of the novel of real life:

"The hero of the new episode is not a knight, but a plebeian; his morals are those of a rogue or sharper, and from his Spanish name, *pícaro*, the term *picaresco* has been applied to the narrative of his achievements."

Professor Warren considers it much more original than its predecessors, finds it confined entirely to Spain, and regards it, in its origin, as "not only a study of the rascal, but a protest, besides, against the predominance in literature of the aristocratic type." The account given of the distressing material conditions which it reflects and which also helped create it is especially noteworthy (pp. 290 ff.). The best specimen of this *picaresco* type is *Lazarillo de Tormes*, which appeared anonymously about the middle of the sixteenth century. The exact date is given as "undoubtedly the year 1554." (Lemcke in his *Handbuch der Spanischen Literatur*, vol. ii, p. 212, cites an Antwerp edition bearing the date of 1553.) Professor Warren rejects the old theory of the authorship of Mendoza, and considers it the "work of some discontented member of the middle class."

Popular as *Lazarillo* was, it had no immediate successors. The ban of the Inquisition fell upon it, and not until forty-five years later did the second *picaresco* novel appear: *Guzman de Alfarache*, the type of the second school is compared with its model, and its immense influence, through translations and imitations in foreign literatures, is well described.

The wonderful productiveness of sixteenth century Spain is further evidenced by the beginnings of other novelistic types, besides those already mentioned. Thus our author finds "echoes of what might almost be called society novels;" as, in San Pedro's *Question de Amore* (1521), the "novel of travel" in Contreras' *Selva de Aventuras* (1573), "the novel of erotic adventure in a definite locality and period—an historical novel in other words," in Hita's *Las Guerras Civiles de Granada* (1595).

Passing very rapidly over the barren field of the novel in Italy and France, Professor Warren dwells a moment on the early efforts of the English as fiction writers. He attributes them to "the great mental stimulus of the Elizabethan era" and to the "translations of Greek and Spanish novels through their French versions," as well as to the Italian *novelle*. Brief mention is made of Lyly's *Euphues* and Sidney's *Arcadia*, and a very interesting comparison is drawn between the Spanish *picaro* and Nash's *Jack Walton*, which redounds rather to the Englishman's credit, though admitting frankly the influence of the Spanish original.

The book closes with very brief mention of the few Chinese moral tales, which may be called novels of manners. They have no artistic finish or merit and are interesting only as descriptions of Chinese customs and as literary curiosities.

The book, as a whole, is one that will do good service in promoting the study of the comparative novel and should find many appreciative readers. The author takes pains to present his theme in an attractive way, his methods are scholarly, his criticisms are careful, conservative and just, his conclusions reliable. The arrangement is good, but a short résumé of all the results arrived at might have been added, with advantage, to many chapters. Instead of a full bibliography, we have "reference to leading authorities added to the text, in the form of notes, under the chapters to which they belong." Among these one regrets the absence of names like Lemcke, Wolff, and other old favorites, even if they are no longer new. A good index makes reference easy. The publishers, too, have done their part well by giving the book a most attractive dress.

ROBERT WALLER DEERING.

Western Reserve University.

#### FRENCH TEXTS.

*A Selection from the Poetry and Comedies of Alfred de Musset.* Edited with an introduction and notes by L. OSCAR KUHN, Professor of Romance Languages in Wesleyan University. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1895. With portrait. 8vo, pp. xxxvii, 282.

*Les Origines de la France contemporaine* par H. A. TAINÉ. Extracts with English notes by A. H. EDGREN, Professor of Romance Languages, University of Nebraska. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1895. With portrait. Boards, 8vo, pp. x, 157.

THE number of books for the study of French that have appeared in this country during the past twelve months, has far exceeded that of any previous year within my remembrance. Our publishers of modern-language texts have kept us fairly busy with merely looking through these numerous aids to class-room work. We may have different views regarding the utility or need of many of these textbooks, and regarding the standard of excellence that should govern the editor in certain cases; but the past winter has brought forth some books, at least, whose opportuneness and superiority are so marked, that few, if any, of us will fail to concur in a general approval of them. Among these latter belongs the present edition of *Alfred de Musset*.

It is a real pleasure to come upon such a sober and scholarly piece of work as that of Professor Kuhns. Musset is not an easy writer to handle, if we keep duly in mind the demands of the class-room. Because of the extravagant side of the poet, as also because of the lack of a satisfactory edition of his works, he has not hitherto received a great amount of comprehensive study at the hands of college classes. It is, perhaps, trite to add that he has not received the study which he deserves. I have, myself, known of but one annotated edition of the author to which there has been access in this country, that of Gustave Masson in the Hachette series. As a piece of editing this book was found very shallow and unsatisfactory. It was not representative enough of the writer's lyric work, though it did go a step farther than the present edition in including two of his stories. But a scholarly, dignified treatment of Musset was much needed and is most welcome. Professor Kuhns has carried out his task most conscientiously, and has given us an edition which betokens much careful thought as well as discriminating judgment. If, touching some matters of detail, my views differ from those



of the editor, I have only words of praise for his work as a whole; and indeed any expression of differing opinion will be offered less in a spirit of criticism, than for the further perfecting, possibly, of a work in general plan and execution so agreeable.

The editor has prefaced the text with an exhaustive and common-sense study of Musset as a writer and man. The weak sides of his career are handled with due discretion and reserve; but nothing is palliated, and nothing is left unsaid which can be used to throw light upon the poet's work. The George Sand episode is left about where we have known it, awaiting further light from the publication of the correspondence between her and our author. A very just estimate is placed upon the poetic genius of the writer; the analysis of his dramatic work is also exceedingly good; and I like the pointed contrasts that are made between Musset and his great contemporary, Victor Hugo. The effeminacy and languidness of the former are set over against the energy and aggressiveness of the latter; but scholarly ideas and becoming modesty are seen in one, while vague ideas and excessive vanity characterize the other.

The introduction is followed by a bibliography, which includes the most that has been written on the author. I should like to see added to the list a recent article in *The Nineteenth Century* (March 1893) by Leopold Katscher, not because it is more authoritative than others, but as being a very readable essay, of easy access for the average student.

Coming to the text, we are at the very start (with the exception of the introductory lines *Au Lecteur*) brought face to face with the heavy portions of *Rolla*. The editor may have felt justified in placing the selection from *Rolla* first, as showing the skeptical attitude of the poet, a man "born too late in a world too old"; but I can not help feeling that these passages would arouse a greater interest in the student, could they be led up to by something lighter. And this brings me to say that, while the best of Musset's longer poems (including *les Nuits*) are given in the edition, his shorter pieces, excepting the lines

noted above, are wholly absent. As I made an effort a few years ago, in my *Introduction to Modern French Lyrics*, to give some of the typical shorter poems of the author, I of course, on personal grounds, can not object to their being omitted in the present edition. But if the volume is to be representative, if it "is to aid the student of French literature to form a just estimate of Alfred de Musset as man and poet," there will be found instructors, I fancy, who will miss the lighter note, and regret the absence, among others, of that gem, the *Chanson de Fortunio*, with, perhaps, two or three of the sonnets. From Musset's dramatic work three pieces are given: *À quoi rêvent les jeunes filles*, *On ne badine pas avec l'amour*, and *un Caprice*. These selections are excellent. Into the writer's stories the editor does not go, perhaps for the reason that to do so would have made his volume too bulky.

As to the notes their distinguishing feature is the large number of parallel passages that are given. These quotations, consisting chiefly of lines or stanzas of poetry, occur on almost every page, often several on a page. They find their justification, we are told, "in the fact that Alfred de Musset was always strongly influenced by the great writers and shows this influence constantly in his own works." And the editor hopes that in this way an impulse may be given the student toward the comparative study of literature. This is very good, at least in theory, and Professor Kuhns has certainly shown much versatility in bringing together such a fund of parallelisms. I can not but think, however, that from the standpoint of our students, the subject has been carried too far and made too erudite. The number of languages quoted from is relatively large; it includes English, French, Old-French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin and Provençal. In several instances as many as five of these idioms are introduced on a single page. To be sure most of the Italian passages (Dante is often quoted) are translated, but those from Goethe may be found beyond the ready grasp of many a student. It is, of course, of much interest to us to know that a given line of Musset recalls certain lines of the *Inferno*, and that Dante evidently found the suggestion



for his lines in a certain passage in Vergil, and to have all these passages grouped before our eyes. It is also interesting to know that *au coin du feu*, in a given context, "is equivalent to the German *vertraulich* or *gemütlich*"; but the student, in order to appreciate these many and varied quotations, must certainly have done far more specializing in languages than ever falls to the lot of the undergraduate; and we do not want to compel him to study German, Italian or Latin side by side with the lines of Musset.

As a book, the edition is very attractive, misprints being exceedingly few. A careful reading has brought to my notice only the following: p. 94, l. 14, for *longue* read *langue*, and p. 124, l. 2 for *quand* read *quant*. On p. xi, where mention is made of "the *Temps*," I should prefer to see the French definite article used, so as to be uniform with another reference on the same page. On p. 279, in quoting the famous lines which Francis I. engraved upon a window of the chateau of Chambord, the editor changes and modernizes them. There was no need of this, as old forms are elsewhere freely introduced, and, as given, the lines are not good poetry. The edition of Professor Kuhns will, it is hoped, bring about a more wide-spread and rational study of Alfred de Musset. It should also, and this is the editor's wish, contribute toward a stronger accentuation of the purely literary side of modern-language teaching in our colleges and universities.

*Les Origines de la France contemporaine*, as edited by Professor Edgren, is a less pretentious volume, and calls for less extended treatment. It is the second historical text that the editor has sent out within a year or thereabouts, the first containing extracts from Thiers, descriptive of Napoleon's Egyptian Campaign. The book before us is given up to "a few brief samples" of Taine's comprehensive work; in the choice of material the editor has been guided somewhat by Hoffmann's selections from the same source for German schools. The extracts are grouped under three heads: The Old Régime, The Revolution and Napoleon Bonaparte. They are well chosen and very interesting; the

chapters on *la Cour*, *la vie de Salon* and *Napoléon* being of special interest, though to attempt to discriminate may seem futile when we are reading the French of such a master. The absence of a table of contents is noticeable.

About a dozen pages are devoted to the matter of annotation; accordingly the notes are sparse, and they seem to bear evidence of rather hurried proof-reading. It is the editor's purpose to explain only such words as are not readily found in the ordinary school dictionaries. Our standards in such matters are sure to be somewhat relative, but, the text being evidently intended for early reading, I should like to have seen aid given upon such expressions as: *assister à* (p. ix, l. 4), *parti pris* (p. x, l. 24) with *prendre parti* elsewhere, *payer de sa personne* (p. 7, l. 15) and *Aussi bien* (p. 26, l. 8); especially since *de même*, *telle quelle*, *tête baissée* and *bon gré mal gré* receive attention. These latter expressions are easily found in the dictionaries of Bellows and Heath. It might also have been well to annotate expressions like *bouquet rouge*; likewise such names as *Scévola* and *Santerre* on p. 82, others of like prominence being explained.

Touching inaccuracy of annotation, attention may be called to the following points: The note to l. 8, p. 50 (*la prise de la Bastille*) would better apply to the first occurrence of the expression four pages before. It might also be better to give the notices upon Danton, Marat and Robespierre at their first occurrence, or at least to make one notice serve for each man; at present two notices are given to each, with a repetition of the dates, those of Robespierre being given differently in the two cases. Desmoulins is also annotated twice. The notes on *la Carmagnole* and *le Ça ira* (p. 152) are so stated as to be misleading if not inaccurate.

Touching the numerous errata of the notes, I can only refer briefly to those that I have noted: p. 147, at bottom, and p. 149, at top, wrong line reference; p. 148, for *l'était* read *était*; p. 150, notes to p. 55, both line references wrong; p. 151, at middle, insert p. 72 and correct misprint; p. 152, wrong reference in *Girondins* and spelling in *Strasbourg*;

p. 153, note to p. 88, wrong reference; p. 156, at middle, wrong page reference and misprints in first two line references; p. 157, page reference repeated. In the text misprints were noticed at p. ix, l. 22, and p. 26, ll. 12 and 16. Most of these slips are of little consequence in themselves, and are doubtless due to mere haste or oversight. With their elimination the book will offer very profitable material for first-year work, where a sound historical style is desired.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

### HEINE IN FRANCE.

*Heine in Frankreich.* Eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung von Dr. LOUIS P. BETZ. Zürich: Albert Müller's Verlag. 1895. 8vo, pp. xii, 464.

In this ponderous Zürich dissertation, we are given an exhaustive study of Heine in all his relations to French literature; a study evidently based on the most thorough and patient investigation, and offering much that is of interest to the Heine-enthusiast.

The introductory chapter, devoted to a sketch of literary Paris in 1831, and of Heine's relation to French romanticism, hardly calls for remark, though we might pause to question such statements as the following, regarding Hugo:—(p. 21) "1824—galt er schon allgemein als ebenbürtiger Rivale Lamartine's," and (p. 22) "dass Victor Hugo vor der Julirevolution die vornehmsten, geist- und wirkungsvollsten Werke seiner langen Dichterbahn geschaffen hatte,"—both of which statements are rather wide of the mark.

The following chapter, on Heine in the light of French criticism, is chiefly valuable as a complete guide to Heine-literature in France. We are introduced to the principal French monographs on the poet, including the introductions to translations of his works, then to the various memoirs in which he is noticed; and, finally, the author has collated all the casual mention of Heine to be found in the works and letters of famous writers—from George Sand and Sainte-Beuve to the notorious Jew-baiter, Édouard Drumont. The opinions expressed naturally vary greatly in

character and value, though the general tone of eulogy is as striking as the studied detraction that is so prevalent in German mention of this great German poet. It would be difficult, indeed, to find more stupid depreciation of Heine than that attempted by Jules Janin; but then it was this critical Czar of the *Journal des Débats* who uttered the luminous sentiment: "Toutes les amoureuses célébrées par de Goethe, par Heine, par Lord Byron, bien plus par Shakespeare, ne valent pas la plus simple bergère de nos vieux poètes!"—On the other hand, it would be equally difficult to point out a finer psychological study of Heine as a man and a poet, than that given by Émile Hennequin; and the judgments of Montégut and Ducros are also worthy of the most serious attention.

The tradition that Heine was a bilingual poet is so firmly and widely established, that one can hardly mention his name to an educated Frenchman without evoking an enthusiastic eulogy of Heine as a perfect master of the French language. This legend has been assailed more than once, most successfully and conclusively by one of Heine's translators, Édouard Grenier, in his *Souvenirs littéraires*; Dr. Betz again demolishes it in the third chapter of his dissertation, by appealing to the poet's own testimony and to that of his personal acquaintances, and by printing a number of autograph letters, including one to Balzac in facsimile, proving beyond peradventure that Heine never learned to write a French letter without blunders in grammar and orthography.—It is interesting to note, further, that Heine never acquired an ear for French versification, since he was capable of misquoting a Hexameter as follows:—

"Où l'innocence périt, c'est un crime de vivre!"

It was to be expected that frequent attempts should be made in France to translate Heine's works, and yet one is surprised to find, in the fourth chapter of Dr. Betz's book, the names of forty-odd writers, great and small, who ventured upon the impossible task of interpreting Heine to the French public. The author, indeed, while conceding the extreme difficulty, believes in the possibility of adequately reproducing German lyrics in French, and yet the very best of the numerous transla-



tions quoted falls far short of the requirements set up by Dr. Betz himself—"Geist und Stimmung des Originals beizubehalten, so dass das übertragene Lied analog auf Verstand und Gemüt des Fremden einwirkt." A careful and even appreciative perusal of the efforts of these French translators singularly confirms the conviction, that the Frenchman who is ignorant of German, even if he be an admirer of these translations, will forever admire an entirely fictitious, or rather factitious, Heine.

As for the usefulness of translation, that is another question; doubtless it is well that non-Germans should possess a base imitation of Heine, rather than no Heine at all.

In the fifth and final chapter, we come to the most important and most difficult part of the author's investigation, the study of Heine's influence in France. This chapter is certainly a contribution to the comparative literature of France and Germany, at least in the sense of offering a considerable fund of material, and frequent indications as to fruitful subjects of investigation. The chapter is, indeed, too fragmentary and disjointed to leave a very clear final impression, but that is perhaps inevitable under the circumstances. The author traces Heine's influence in the works of a host of French poets, belonging to a very prismatic variety of "schools:"—Gautier and Musset, Catulle Mendès, Coppée and Léon Valade, the Goncourts, Bourget, Baudelaire, Richepin, Verlaine and many others. These individual studies are too brief to be exhaustive, and not sufficiently systematized to place Heine's total influence in the proper light; but they inspire confidence in the author's fitness for the difficult and exceedingly delicate task here attempted, and promise valuable results for the monographs which will doubtless follow the present work, and from which alone Heine's account with French literature can be correctly balanced. Dr. Betz certainly deserves all encouragement to continue the work he has so auspiciously begun.—The somewhat negligent proof-reading of the present volume, occasional lapses in style, and several omissions from the very useful Index, call for a passing word of criticism.

JOHN S. NOLLEN.

Iowa College.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### CHEVAL DE FOND.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—In their little tilt, in your May number, over certain translations, it seems strange that neither Dr. Symington nor Dr. Lewis appears to have understood the precise equivalent, in English, of *cheval de fond*. Littré, under *fond*, says: "avoir du fond, se dit d'un cheval qui supporte un long exercice sans se fatiguer." Of such a horse we say, in English, he has bottom, good staying qualities or good wind. Hence *un cheval de fond* is a horse of bottom, or good bottom, as is more commonly said; that is, the literal translation is the exact English equivalent. Dr. Lewis's free rendering ("a horse of good qualities") is wide of the mark, since a horse may have most excellent qualities and yet have no bottom. Again, his literal translation ("a horse of depth") is equally faulty, since *depth* is rarely ever the equivalent of *fond*, which may usually be rendered by *bottom* or *further end*.

SAMUEL GARNER.

U. S. Naval Academy.

### GOTHIC *haiþi*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—This word has been connected by some with Skt. *kṣētra-m*. This is, however, phonetically improbable if we derive *kṣētra-m* from √ *kṣi* "to dwell," Gk. *κτίσις*. The original meaning of the Germanic *haiþið* is a 'treeless, uncultivated plain' (Kluge). It is in direct contrast, therefore, with the word for 'mountain,' which interchanges with that for 'forest.' Thus Goth. *fairguni*, 'mountain': O.H.G. *forst* (cf. Kluge, *Etym. Wtb.* sub *Forst*, and Noreen, *Urg. Lautlehre*, pp. 131, 175) and Skt. *giri-ś*, Av. *gairi-š*, 'mountain': Lith. *gire*, 'forest.'

Now, the Germanic *haiþið* might well mean 'low-lying land,' and we may refer it to pre-Germanic *koi-tiā* from the I.E. √ *ki-*, seen in Skt. *çē-ti*, Av. *sae-ti*, Gk. *κεῖται*, *κοι-ται*, and, according to Miklosich, in O. Slav. *ś-mi*, Lith. *szei-mýna*, etc.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Chicago.



WAS *Paradise Lost* SUGGESTED BY  
THE MYSTERY PLAYS?

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS: L. Toulmin Smith in her edition of the *York Plays* enumerates eleven plays extant on the Creation, Fall of Lucifer, Adam, Eve and the Garden of Eden, Man's Disobedience and Fall; and she mentions many others on the Nativity and Temptation.

Shakespeare refers to the over-drawn characters in the plays when he speaks of out-Heroding Herod, and Milton too in his extensive study of literature, must have become acquainted with them. If so, a sudden change in his mind can be accounted for. In 1639, he announced in his *Epitaphium Damonis* that he intended to write an epic on King Arthur and the Early Britains, but in 1641, he turned to Biblical subjects, and at the same time to the notion of dramatic form. He actually sketched some sixty dramas possible from the Old and New Testament, preferring the subject of *Paradise Lost*.

Aware doubtless of his lack of dramatic genius, he despaired of his plan for many years, because that inviting theme seemed inseparable from its impracticable form. Had Caedmon's epic suggested the *Paradise Lost* (as some affirm) his change from the first plan would have been only one of subject, and the dilemma would never have arisen.

To one somewhat favorable to this solution, it seems as if a play given by the Innholders still lingered in the poet's mind when he wrote the opening of Book Third. The two are given for comparison.

"Hail holy Light, offspring of Heav'n first-born,  
Or of th' Eternal co-eternal beam  
May I express thee unblam'd? since God is light,  
And never but in unapproach'd light  
Dwelt from eternity, dwelt then in thee,  
.....  
Before the Heavens thou wert, and at the voice  
Of God, as with a mantle didst invest  
The rising world of waters dark and deep,  
Won from the void and formless infinite."

"Hayl fulgent Phebus and fader eternall  
Parfite plasmator (creator) and god omnipotent  
Be whose will and power perpetuall  
All things hath influence and beyng verreyment.  
.....  
Graunte me thi grace, I thee beseke hertely,  
In woorde ne dede the never to offende."

.....  
*Responcio Patris ad Filium.*  
O lampe of light | Olumen eternall  
O co-equal sonne | O verrey sapience."

HERBERT HARRIS.

Lewisburg, Pa.

BRIEF MENTION.

Few students of the Romance languages will need to have their attention called to the rare merits of the second series of Adolf Tobler's *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik* (Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1894, 8vo, pp. 250). To beginners in the historical study of French syntax—who are unlikely to find lectures offered on the subject either in the European or the American Universities—no course of reading at once more solid and more fascinating could be recommended than vol. iii of Diez' *Grammatik*, followed by the two volumes of Tobler's *Vermischte Beiträge*, gathered chiefly from contributions to the *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.* This second collection is especially welcome, since in addition to the articles that have appeared in recent years in the *Zeitschrift*, it presents the author's contributions to the *Philologischen Abhandlungen*, Heinrich Schweizer-Sidler . . . gewidmet (Zurich, 1891), namely, "*Donc*," "*Des cent ans*" and "*Vom Gebrauche des Futurum Praeteriti*," three articles that had not before appeared in print, of which the most important is on the "Adjectiv in Substantivfunction" (the illustrations are drawn largely from Loti, Bourget, Zola and the current periodicals); and the treatise on *Verblümter Ausdruck und Wortspiel in alter Rede*, increased to nearly twice the size in which it originally appeared in 1882. Such is the unique importance of these contributions, taken collectively, that one who is unfamiliar with their results can scarcely be regarded as having even an adequate reading knowledge of Old French.

An Organisation entitled "The Central Modern Language Conference" has been formed for the Western States; Prof. W. H. Carruth (University of Kansas) is the President and Prof. H. Schmidt-Wartenberg (University of Chicago) is the Secretary of the new Society, regarding which a circular letter will appear in our next issue.

## JOURNAL NOTICES.

ARKIV FOER NORDISK FILOLOGI. NEW SERIES. VOL. VII. PART 2.—**Hjelmqvist, Theodor**, Några anmärkningar till Atlamål.—**Kock, Axel**, Studier i fornordisk grammatik. I-vii.—**Beckman, Nat.**, Bidrag till kännedomen om 1700-talets svenska. Huvudsakligen efter Sven Hofs arbeten.—**Dyrlund, F.**, "Kr. Mikkelen, Dansk Sproglære med sproghistoriske Tillæg. Haandbog for Lærere og viderekomme." Anmeldelse med sproghistoriske indskud.—**Kauffmann, Friedrich**, Anmälan av "Friedrich Kluge, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Fünfte verbesserte Auflage."—**Olrik, Axel**, Anmälan av "Fr. Kauffmann, Deutsche Mythologie. 2. Auflage."—**Nielsen, O.**, En Bemærkning. PART 3.—**Beckman, Nat.**, Bidrag till kännedomen om 1700-talets svenska. Huvudsakligen efter Sven Hofs arbeten (Forts.).—**Lind, E. H.**, Några anmärkningar om nordiska personnamn 1-111.—**Llud, E. H.**, Bibliografi för år 1893.—**Kahle, B.**, Anmälan av "Jiriczek, Otto Luitpold, Die Bösa-saga in zwei fassungen nebst proben aus den Bösa-rimur."—**Kauffmann, Friedrich**, Anmälan av "Uppsalastudier tillagnade Sophus Bugge."—**Larsson, Ludvig**, Anmälan av "Svensk ordlista med reformstavning ock uttalsbeteckning under medvärkan av Hilda Lundell ock Elise Zetterqvist samt flere faekmän utgiven av J. A. Lundell."—**Kalund, Kr.**, Rettelse til J. Fritznors Gammelnorske Ordbog, 2. udg. PART 4.—**Kock, Axel**, Några grammatiska bidrag i-viii.—**Hellqvist, Elof**, Ordförklaringar 1-2.—**Wadstein, Ellis**, Norska homilie-bokens nedskrivningsort.—**Jonsson, Jon**, Fæinar athugasemdir um forn ættnöfn.—**Brate, Erik**, Anmälan av "Norges Indskrifter med de ældre Runer, udg. af Sophus Bugge." 1ste og 2 det Hefte.—**Wadstein, Ellis**, Anmälan av "Ordbok öfver Svenska Språket utg. af Svenska Akademien." Häftet 10.—**D., F.**—Rettelser og tillæg til Arkiv No. 1. vii., 33 ff. og 180 ff.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHES CENTRALBLATT. NEUNTER JAHRGANG, NR. 3, MÄRZ 1895.—S-e, Einige Bemerkungen über Schulfragen und zur Frage der deutschen Aussprache.—Berichte aus den Vereinen: Würzner: Vorschule für Lehramtskandidaten. Danzig: Jahresbericht.—Litteratur: Besprechungen.—**Helmemann**, Kalender für Lehrer.—**Breul**, The training of teachers [Ey].—**Plat**, Lehrgang der englischen Sprache, II [Gugel].—**Loewe**, English Grammar, I [Sandmann].—**Iota**, Children of Circumstances.—**Wolter**, Frankreich [Faust].—**Bretschneider**, Vie d'Oberlin [Weiss].—**Hermant**, Eddy et Paddy.—**Rod**, Roches Blanches.—**Corday**, Femmes d'Officiers [Sandmann].—Neue Erscheinungen.—**Muehtbrecht**, Übersetzungen aus dem Deutschen in die dänische, englische, französische, holländische, italienische, norwegische, schwedische und spanische Sprache.—Inhaltsangabe, Zeitschriften.—Miscellen: Dokument in Bezug auf Napoleon I.—Das Russische als Lehrgegenstand in deutschen Schulen.—Personalien.—Versammlungen: Congresso italiano neofilologico; Verhandlungen der

42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner. Ferienkurse.—Anzeigen.

DIE NEUEREN SPRACHEN. ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEN NEUSPRACHLICHEN UNTERRICHT. MIT DEM BEIHLATT PHONETISCHE STUDIEN. II. BAND, 7 HEFT, DEZEMBER 1894.—**Von Glode, O.**, in Weimar, i. M. (III.) Die französische Interpunktionslehre.—**Von Lenz, Rudolf**, in Santiago de Chile. Der neusprachliche Unterricht in Chile.—**Von Andersin, Hanna**, in Helsingfors, Finnland. O. Schenck, Deutsche Sprachlehre für ausländer. Zur benutzung für schulen im auslande sowie für internationale unterrichtsanstalten im inlande.—**Von Klinghardt, H.**, in Rendsburg. Mrs. Craik, A Hero. A Tale for Boys.—**Von Krou, R.**, in M.-Gadbach. Tales and Stories from Modern Writers. Erstes bündchen. Für den schulgebrauch bearbeitet von J. Klapperieh.—**Von Breul, Karl**, in Cambridge. The Training of Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages.—**Von D., F.**, Die reform in Karlsruhe.—**Von V., W.**, Wandbilder zur englischen geschichte.—**Von V., W.**, Eine neue facheitzeitsehrift (Modern Languages).—II BAND, 8 HEFT, JANUAR 1895.—**Von Walter, M.**, in Frankfurt a. M. Überschriftliche arbeiten im fremdsprachlichen unterricht nach der neuen methode. Vortrag, gehalten auf dem 6. allgem. deutschen neuphilologentage zu Karlsruhe.—**Von Graudgent, C. H.**, in Cambridge, Mass. English in America.—**Von Wickerhauser, N.**, in Agram. Das resultat eines schuljahres englischen unterrichts nach Vietor und Dörss Lehrplan I.—**Von Weudt, G.**, in Hamburg. England im jahre 1894.—**Von Klinghardt, H.**, in Rendsburg. Franz Beyer, Der neue sprachunterricht. Ergebnisse der lehrpraxis nebst erörterungen und leitsätzen.—**Von Klinghardt, H.**, in Rendsburg. Emil Hausknecht, 1) The English Student. Lehrbuch zur einföhrung in die englische sprache und landeskunde. 2) The English Reader. Ergänzungsband zu The English Student. 3) Beiwort zu The English Student und The English Reader.—**Von D., F.**, William Hanby Crump, English as it is spoken. 10th ed.—**Von Schmager, O.**, in Gera. Strien, Schulgrammatik d. franz. sprache. I. abtheilung: Laut- und formenlehre. Ausgabe B: Für gymnasien und realgymnasien.—**Von Hengesbach**, in Meseritz. Dr. Fritz Meissner, Der einfluss deutschen geistes auf die französische litteratur des 19 jahrhunderts bis 1870.—**Von Sarrazin, J.** in Freiburg i. Br. Karl Kühn, Franz. lesebuch. Mittelstufe.—**Von Schmidt, Dr. H.**, in Altona-Ottensen. Wilhelm Fick, Zur methode des englischen anfangsunterrichts.—**Von Vietor, W.**, in Marburg. Laura Soames †.—**Von Sarrazin, J.**, in Freiburg i. Br. Altfranzösisch und neuf Französisch.—**Von Krummacher, M.**, in Kassel. Wordsworth in Cambridge. Litterarhistorische makame; an Adolf Brennecke († 1891).—**Von V., W.**, Unsere reform in Kanada.—**Von Schürner**, in Rheda. Erklärung.—**Von Krou, R.**, in M.-Gladbach. Entgegnung.—**Von Barnstroph, H.**, in Altona. Erdwiderung.—**Von Beyer, A.**, in Bremen. Antwort.—**Von Roemer, Dr. Ludwig**, in Frankfurt a. M. Erwidung.



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, December, 1895.

## ANOTHER NOTE ON RECENT BRITICISMS.

IN a little paper in MOD. LANG. NOTES (December, 1894) I suggested the necessity of a dictionary of Briticisms. We have more than one dictionary of Americanisms, although no one of them is really adequate or satisfactory. Yet we have no dictionary of Briticisms, although the current vocabulary of Great Britain abounds in words and phrases peculiar to the inhabitants of the British Isles and often not acceptable to that large majority of the English-speaking peoples which does not inhabit England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The fact has to be faced that the inhabitants of the British Isles are now no longer the sole owners of the English language. The variations of their speech from "standard English" deserve to be recorded quite as much as the variations in America or in Australia. And these British variations from "standard English" are, I think, quite as numerous nowadays as the American variations, abundant as are the latter. In the hope that I may arouse some student of linguistics to undertake the labor of preparing a dictionary of Briticisms I have here brought together a score of them.

**BEWARE** (as a verb). Mr. W. H. Bishop sends an interesting sentence from an article by the Hon. Lionel Tollemache in the *Fortnightly Review* for March, 1876:—

'He [the traveller] will almost certainly take the opposite road, *bewaring* however, if he be an Englishman, of the Germanized Kurhaus.'

**CONTINUATIVENESS**. In the London *Spectator* for June 15th, 1895, is an article on "Lord Acton's First Lecture," in which we find this sentence:—

"It is probable, individually we think almost certain, that a man broke suddenly and completely the *continuativeness* of Peruvian history."

**DIALOGICAL**. The style of the London *Athenæum* is far more slovenly than that of any American critical weekly of like pretensions, and its columns will have to be searched

very carefully by anyone who undertakes to compile a dictionary of Briticisms. In the number for Sept. 7th, 1895, there is a review of a novel in which this sentence is to be found:—

The story is fairly amusing and very flippant; it is anything but serious, and is told in what may be called the *dialogical* style, abounding in forced and cynical repartees.

**DRAW** (as a noun). In a London weekly called the *Queen* and devoted to the discussion of that division of human affairs most interesting to women, there is a department of answers to correspondents. In the number for June 29th, 1895, advice is given to a lady who had apparently enquired how to make an outdoor entertainment profitable:—

"You should engage a local band, and you might inaugurate athletic sports, which are always a good *draw*, also a cricket match. These latter, well advertised, would bring a large assemblage together."

**ELECTROGRAVURE**. In a London monthly review called the *Bookman* and edited by a Mr. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D., and in the number for June, 1895, at page 94, is to be found an editorial note referring to a new British edition of Thoreau's 'Week on the Concord and Merrimac Rivers' as "a pretty edition with an *electrogravure* of Thoreau's Cave." It would be interesting to know whether *electrogravure* is the invention of the editor of the *Bookman*, or of the London publisher of this unauthorized edition of an American book.

**EXCESSED**. On certain of the railroads of England, the habit now obtains of pasting a small label containing only the word *excesed* on the trunks of a passenger who had been forced to pay for the weight of his baggage in excess of the amount allowed by the regulations of the company. This invention of a past participle for a non-existent verb is so daring that I am in daily expectation of seeing some British critic denounce it as an Americanism.

**GROOVY and GROOVINESS**. In a London popular magazine called the *Idler*, in the number for July, 1895, is an article by a Mr. J. F. Nisbet, of which the opening paragraph may be quoted here:



### THE *Grooviness* OF HUMAN NATURE.

You are lucky if, being with a sentimental or philosophical friend at some great public gathering, he does not bore you with the remark: "How strange to think that all these people, men and women, swarming denizens of a vast human ant-hill, have each their histories." It is boring because you must often have thought the same thing yourself. For such a reflection the Crystal Palace or the Earl's Court Exhibition is a convenient spot. Seeing thousands of people in the mass, one is inclined to suppose that they represent thousands of different experiences—that each life has been lived upon lines of its own, with joys and sorrows, hopes and fears, of a special brand. I doubt, however, whether this is so. Human nature is very *groovy*.

**MUNICIPALIZATION:** A letter to the editor of the London *Times*, pointing out the success of the tramways in Glasgow which are owned by the city itself, was published in that journal on August 20th, 1895, and it received as a title this phrase:—"The *Municipalization* of Tramways." The noun *municipalization* seems to imply the word *municipalize*, although this I have not yet happened to see in any British paper.

**PLAYETTE.** Attention has already been called to the *Briticisms*, *storiette* and *lead-erette*. Akin to these is *playette*. In the London *Queen* for August 24th, 1895, is to be found this paragraph:—

Mr. Fred. Upton has been telling for months many admirable little English *storiettes*. A three volume novel told in five minutes, "A Grandfather in spite of Himself," and "The Story of a Day," linger pleasantly in my memory. In some of the little *playettes* which have had great success, he has been ably aided by his wife.

**RAIL.** In a new British sporting monthly, the *Badminton Magazine*, in the number for August, 1895, there is an article by the Earl of Onslow on "The West End on Wheels." Advice is given as to the best bicycle excursions in the immediate vicinity of London. One paragraph is as follows:—

The Ripley Road has become a proverb among cyclists for excellence of metalling and beauty of scenery, and those who wish to try it cannot do better than *rail* to Surbiton, and ride thence nine miles to the Hut at Wisley, a charming little spot at the edge of a lake with rhododendron-covered islands, surrounded by pine woods and heather. The accommodation

is not, of course, first-class; so if anything in the way of entertainment be contemplated the commissariat department in the Metropolis must be relied on.

The use is to be noted of the word *metalling* to indicate the surface of a macadamized road.

**SERIALIST.** Among the *Briticisms* included in an earlier paper in these pages was *serialize*, quoted from the columns of the *Author*. It is probably the use of *serialize* that has led to the use of *serialist*, which can be found in the number of the London *World* for June 12th, 1895:—

"Miss Rhoda Broughton figures once again as a *serialist* in *Temple Bar* this month."

**SERMONETTE.** In the "Note on Recent *Briticisms*" the use of the word *essayette* by Mr. Coventry Patmore was noted. In the advertising columns of the *Bookman* for January, 1895, is to be found a word even more extraordinary, *sermonette*. The Midland Educational Co. Ltd. of Birmingham and Leamington announced that it had just published

*Sermonettes* from Tennyson. From *Studies* of Tennyson's Ethical Teachings. By Achilles Taylor. 68 pages, pseudonym 8vo, cloth, 1 s.

**SLANGING.** In the London *Athenæum* for Sept. 7th, 1895, there is a review of a novel which concludes with this elegant sentence:—

The most satisfactory part is the *slanging all round* which they give one another at the end.

**SOLUTION** (as a verb). In a London weekly devoted to sport and called the *Field*, in the number for August 31st, 1895, at page 396, there is an account of a method of repairing a bicycle tire, in the course of which we are informed that "short transverse strips of canvas are *solutioned* on," etc.

**TIRADE** (as a verb). As a noun the French word *tirade* seems to be fairly acclimated in English; but it was left for a British author first to use it as a verb—a use for which there is, I think, no warrant in the French language. In an article on Froude in *Scribner's Magazine* for February, 1895, Mr. Augustine Birrell, Q.C., M.P., has this sentence:—

It was Carlyle's humor to fancy himself a Puritan, and he was perhaps one to this extent, at all events, that he would not allow any

one but himself to *tirade* against 'old Jews' clothes' (p. 153).

UP-TO-DATENESS. In the number of the *Author* for January, 1895, there is a note from Mr. J. M. Lely, containing this paragraph:—

Then as to "up-to-dateness." I have seen this word used in the *Referee*, but I believe it to be considered as generally unfit for serious prose. But by what word or what number of words can its obvious meaning be expressed? Surely the sooner the word, or a better single word, if such can be found, is admitted into serious prose the better.

VERT. The *Century Dictionary* notes as a British colloquialism a verb *to vert*, meaning to change from one religious sect to another. Of late this Britishism has had its meaning enlarged to include a political as well as a religious change of faith. The Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge has kindly sent me a clipping from the London *Daily Telegraph* of July 15th, in which we are informed that "among the seats which should be captured are Reading, which *verted* from Unionism in 1892, Devonport," etc.

WIN (as a noun). The *Galignani Messenger*, although published in France, is the most British of journals; and the searcher for Britishisms can find his game in almost any number of this ill-printed Parisian sheet. But it is not common to find as many as there are in the following paragraph in the issue for July 11th, 1895:—

Never has there been such a popular *win* in the whole history of the Regatta as when Trinity Hall, the only Cambridge eight entered in the Grand Challenge, paddled past the winning-post some 10 lengths ahead of the American Cornell University crew. The time of the race, 7 min. 12 sec., does not make it out very fast, as yesterday's breeze had gone down, and what little air there was blew across and not down the course. Cornell, with their very rapid stroke, gained a little after the start, but soon fell back to the Englishmen. At Fawley—reached in the quick time of 2 min. 23 sec.—they were scarcely more than their canvas ahead. From that point, rowing beautifully together in true 'Varsity style, Hall gradually *wore* the Yankees *down*. The latter's form gradually deteriorated as they got more and more *backed*, and when the Hall boat began to lead them, they caved in altogether, though they did not actually stop.

WORSEMENT. In the United States "special assessments" are levied on real estate which is raised in value by the opening of new

streets, the laying out of squares, etc. In Great Britain the ground landlords have bitterly resented any attempt to make them bear a share of the cost of the municipal improvements which benefitted their property. One of their methods was to call these improvements *betterments*, and then to denounce this word as an Americanism. So far as I know the word is wholly unknown in the United States. In Great Britain its use has led logically to the invention of *worsement* to indicate the injury sometimes done to a special property by a scheme of general improvement. In the *Illustrated London News* of June 1st, 1895, in a report of the doings of Parliament was the following paragraph:—

The Finance Bill was read a third time without amendment, and a compromise on the *betterment* question removed at last the principal obstacle to the prosecution of improvements by the London County Council. This compromise admits the principle of compensation to owners of property for "*worsement*."

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

Columbia College, N. Y.

#### ARE THE HACKMAN-REAY LOVE-LETTERS GENUINE?<sup>1</sup>

In the spring of 1779 all London was shocked at the murder of Miss Reay, by Mr. Hackman. The former was the extremely beautiful and accomplished mistress of the dissolute Lord Sandwich, then First Lord of the Admiralty; to him, in the course of seventeen years, she bore nine children, among them Basil Montagu,—the Montagu who tried to make the world believe that Lord Bacon was not the scoundrel he had sometimes been painted. James Hackman, when he met Martha Reay at the Admiralty (1775) and straightway fell in love with her, was a recruiting officer in the army; three years later he sold his commission, in order to return from his post in Ireland, and be near Miss Reay. In 1879 he took orders. Meantime, the hope he had long cherished of marrying (for the affection was reciprocal) was crushed by learning, through a third person, that he was no longer loved. Al-

<sup>1</sup> The Love-Letters of Mr. H. and Miss R. 1775-1779. Edited by Gilbert Burgess. Chicago: Stone & Kimball 1895.



ways an over-ardent wooer, with a touch of melancholy in his blood, he was now driven to despair. Seeking out his mistress at the theatre with the determination to destroy himself in her presence, he yielded to a sudden frenzy of jealousy and shot first the object of his love, then himself. Miss Reay died instantly; Hackman sustained a mere scalp-wound. The unhappy prisoner was tried for murder, and executed; in his trial he behaved like a man, and in his death like a gentleman.

London was touched to the heart by the piteous fate of the lady, and the sadder end of the lover. Pamphlets told the story; and one, published the next year by Sir Herbert Croft, and called *Love and Madness*, gave what purported to be the correspondence of the unhappy pair. Among the letters was a long one telling for the first time the whole truth about Thomas Chatterton; the documents for this letter were obtained by Croft from the dead poet's mother and sister—the fact that he kept them against agreement and never properly paid for them, calling down upon him in later years the wrath of Robert Southey. *Love and Madness* ran through edition after edition; in the ninth, Croft confessed that the Chatterton letter was his own, and that of the whole correspondence only “the outline” was true. But before this claim there was some talk about the matter, as on the part of Walpole, who, taking a lesson from experience, at once doubted the authenticity of the letters, though acknowledging that the Hackman part was quite in the character of that person; and on the part of Johnson, who blamed Croft for mixing fact and fancy. The whole matter has lain almost out of sight this hundred years, till now Mr. Gilbert Burgess gives us a new redaction of the letters, and assures us of his conviction, formed after “exhaustive investigation,” that, excepting the Chatterton matter, the letters are genuine. Mr. Burgess says:

“No record of Croft's own work tallies at all with the idea that he created such a romance. But, apart from the controversy, the story and the letters seem to me to be a veritable human document of strong interest. And, after exhaustive investigation, I am convinced that such a document is only explainable on the grounds of a real living correspon-

dence and that these letters are, without doubt, those that passed between Hackman and Miss Reay” (p. xvi).

It would seem that the value of the letters as “human documents” can hardly be considered “apart from the controversy.” The letters undoubtedly make a very pretty book to read, for they are quite as strange as any ordinary fiction, and they have literary quality; so Mr. Burgess is not to be blamed for wishing to make a readable and salable volume, rather than a dissertation. But if the book is offered as a “human document,” the editor ought to give us some show of proof that they were actually written a century ago by two people who were lovers. Mr. Burgess tenders very few reasons for his belief. He says that the style of the Chatterton letter is unlike that of the others; accordingly he relegates this epistle to an appendix, and calmly dissects away from the other letters that appeared in *Love and Madness* all references, save one or two, to Chatterton. He advances, apparently as a forcible argument for the genuineness of the series, the facts that Booth, Hackman's brother-in-law, gave Kearsley, the publisher, the papers of the dead man; that Croft published with Kearsley, and that his work was approved by the silence of Booth (who had denounced as inaccurate an earlier, anonymous pamphlet, *The Case and Memoirs of Hackman*). The argument is not weighty. If Booth was alive in April, 1780—Mr. Burgess doubtless knows whether or not he was—and approved the first edition of *Love and Madness*, he must have seen and permitted the Chatterton letter; and a relative who, to lend false credit to Hackman as a *littérateur*, would connive at the Chatterton letter, would connive at more tampering with the dead man's *billets-doux*.

The fact is, as every student knows, that to determine the authenticity of a short piece of prose written soon after Johnson's death, is a most difficult thing. The pseudo-Johnsonian style affected almost every writer; the peculiar regularity and uniformity of Addison's day, which still make it a most delicate task to sort out Bludgell's papers from his master's, had been succeeded by a new but equally baffling common style. Hackman's authen-



tic speech at the trial is pseudo-Johnsonian; and so is Croft's Chatterton letter. No ordinary test of style alone could assure a sound criticism that the author of the letter could not have written the speech. The difficulty of correct judgment in such a matter was recognized at the time by Nichols, who reviewed the first edition of *Love and Madness* in the *Monthly Magazine*, vol. lxii, p. 326, art. 40. The second sentence in this review is quite the best thing ever said regarding the authorship. It's a pity Mr. Burgess did not quote this review, instead of the later, beheaded version which, after appearing in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, May, 1816, was reprinted in the *Illustrations*, whence it is transferred to Mr. Burgess's pages. Nichols first said:

"The letters are given as the correspondence of the late unfortunate Mr. Hackman with Miss Reay. Of their authenticity we can say but little; for though we profess ourselves critics, we pretend not to be conjurors."

A quarter of a century later, after a long and intimate friendship with Croft, he had practically nothing new to say; he dropped, however, his remark about not being "conjurors."

But Mr. Burgess is not afraid of attempting a little conjuring. It remains, therefore, to see how he gets on at it. He is certainly right in finding a difference between the style of the Chatterton letter and that of the other letters, or at least of the earlier ones. The former is comparatively stiff and bookish. It has a long sentence and in parts a slightly stilted diction. The early letters are written in staccato sentences, are highly exclamatory, and at times come to abrupt stops—dashes, the writer becoming inarticulate with emotion. Moreover, these early letters are full of repetitions and roving talk quite unintelligible and tedious to the public, and so characteristic of actual epistolary style that they seem to me to pass the ingenuity of the most skillful forger. In brief, the editor seems right in believing that Croft worked with an actual correspondence before him. It seems doubtful, however, whether the printed letters are without admixture from the hand of Croft; I shall try to give the reasons.

Croft was an exceedingly versatile man. He

tried his hand at dictionary making, at biography, at verse, at sermons (which Johnson found flippant). He wrote such things as these:

"A Brother's Advice to his Sisters," 1775. "Fanaticism and Treason," "The Literary Fly," 1780. "The Abbey of Kilhampton," 1780—"a series of anticipatory epitaphs upon prominent living personages," and a curious French work, "Horace éclairci par la ponctuation," Paris, 1810.

His biography of Young which he contributed to Johnson's *Lives*, impressed Boswell as a good imitation of Johnson's style; and even Burke (according to Malone) admitted that it had the "nodosities" of that style, though lacking its strength. But Croft's style in his letters<sup>2</sup> reveals curious vacillations from this heavier manner to a terse colloquial diction and structure. There is sometimes a dexterity and lightness of touch which is far from the clumsiness that Mr. Burgess finds in the Chatterton letter. I believe Croft to have been capable of introducing many paragraphs in the later letters so deftly as almost to defy detection; he had style enough, he had enough sympathy with the *ethos* of the rôle played by Hackman in this drama of life.

Mr. Burgess speaks of the introduction to the Chatterton letter as a clumsy imitation of Hackman's style. Here it is—or the first paragraph of it—and a sentence or two of the second.

"The task you have set me about Chatterton is only a further proof of your regard for me. You know the warmth of my passions, and you think that if I do not employ myself they may flame out and consume me. Well, then, I will spend a morning or two in arranging what I have collected respecting the author of Rowley's poems. Every syllable you will read I assure you shall be *authentic*."

Did you start at "The author of Rowley's poems?" My mind does not now harbour a doubt that Chatterton wrote the whole, whatever I thought when we read them together at H." (pp. 183-184).

Is this more awkward than the following, which is made to introduce one of Hackman's (?) long, gratuitously gruesome stories of murder?

<sup>2</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine*, February, March, and April, 1800; Nichols's *Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1828, pp. 208-218.

"Did I not tell you on Saturday the particulars of the poor fellow who suffered this day se'nnight for murdering Mrs. Knightly? They are singlar. He was an Italian, I understand. Such a thing is not credible but of an Italian" (p. 135).

Or this, which introduces three pages of themes for historical paintings?

"My opinion of the great man's style of painting who condescends to improve you in drawing is exactly yours. Posterity will agree with us. The subjects you recommended to his pencil are such as I should have expected from my M.'s fancy. While I walked my horse hither this morning two or three subjects of different sorts occurred to me. All of them would not suit his style. But I know one or two of them would not displease you if well executed. Some of them I will send you" (p. 128).

[Then follow four pages of "subjects." It might be noted here that in the forged Chatterton letter there is given just such another subject for historical painting.]

Surely the artificiality is common to all three introductions. But this fashion of dragging in "anecdotes" (as Nichols called them) by the heels, is not more clumsy than many of the literary allusions are superfluous. The long list of historical "subjects" (ending with the grisly scene of Monmouth's bungled execution), and most of the literary quotations, seem alike to spring from Croft's notoriously good memory for miscellany. The letters that contain this leisurely erudition contrast strongly with the passionate single-heartedness of the true Hackman style. Compare, for example, the letter last quoted (Sept. 20, 1777) with the note which precedes it by two months. It may be argued that the styles differ with the subjects; but one subject is natural to Hackman, the other is not.

"Since last night I have changed my mind, totally changed it. I charge you not to see Mrs. Yates this morning. Write her word that your mind is changed. Never will I consent to be supported by your labours. Never, never shall your face, your person, your accomplishments be exposed for so much an hour. By heaven! I will not forgive you if you do not give up all thought of such a thing" (p. 127).

This is characteristic of Hackman. From first to last he was swept on by a tide of love

as unusual in our modern days as it was destructive to him in those. Except a few passing literary references, anything but recondite, he apparently put into his letters little but protestations of love and eager hopes of speedy marriage. It seems inevitable that suspicion must fall upon much of the literary matter and upon the narrative of those ominously modern instances of love-madness with which the letters are "enlivened."

I referred to Croft's fertility of literary allusion and quotation. In some of his work it is obtrusive. Contrast the style of his letters answering Southey, where he is a veritable Dr. Pangloss, with the smooth original web of Southey's letters. In his life of Young he quotes incessantly, even though he knew how sparingly Johnson cited. Some of the *Lives* are utterly without quotation; others introduce whole paragraphs or stanzas, with deliberate preface. But Croft in the *Young* freely sprinkles couplets and quatrains, introducing them with variety and grace of phrase. Now *Love and Madness* has plenty of bits of poetry so slipped in, many of them purely ornamental. The *Auld Robin Gray* is probably quoted by the lovers, except the couplet in the letter of Sept. 20, 1777, where it seems to be foisted in imitation of its earlier use.

Mr. Burgess remarks that from Jan. 26, 1777 on, "Hackman's letters have a morbid vein running through them." And so they have, dwelling as they do on stories of lover's murders, on suicides, on executions. But the case in favor of Hackman's putting such things into his letter is not so good as the case in favor of Croft's seizing the opportunity to work up a fine situation of dramatic nemesis. The stories are told with accuracy and minuteness, some being rehearsed from the newspapers, others from literature. Without exception there is in each some analogy to the final horrors of the Hackman case. The following passage, March 2, 1778, a year before the tragedy, must have come either from a soul more prophetic than Hamlet's, or else from an unscrupulous *littérateur* who knew all the facts of the later tragedy.

"Yet, could I believe (which I own I cannot, from the evidence in this case) that the idea of



destroying her never struck him till his finger was at the trigger; that his only intention was to lay the breathless body of an injured lover at her feet—had this been the fact, however I might have condemned the deed, I certainly should have wept over the momentary phrenzy which committed it. But as nothing appears to have past which could at all make him change his plan, I must (impossible as it seems) suppose him to have deliberately formed so diabolical a plan; and must rejoice that he was not of the same country, while I lament that he was of the same order of beings with myself" (pp. 137, 138).

Mr. Burgess says, without giving his authority, that Hackman "was sufficiently romantic to have kept copies of his letters" (p. v). Nothing strange in an eighteenth century beau, but passing strange in Hackman! One wishes that the cruel Galli, Miss Reay's companion and Hackman's enemy in disguise, had furnished Croft by stealth with the originals of Hackman's letters. For the published letters have many a choked exclamation that ill comports with the notion of a copy; worse yet, there are expressions that, if from copies made by the author of them, sound disingenuous. Thus, Feb. 16, 1776:

"Observe, when I write to you I never pretend to write sense. I have no head; you have made me all heart from top to bottom. Sense—why, I am out of my senses, and have been these six weeks. Were it possible my scrawls to you could ever be read by any one but you I should be called a madman" (p. 47).

And again, in a letter (from Newgate), which, if any, might have been spared the cheap additions of Croft:—

("Should the pen of fancy ever take the trouble to invent letters for me, I should not be suffered to write to you thus, because it would seem *unnatural*. Alas! they know not how gladly a wretch like me forgets himself.") (P. 172.)

One regrets, also, that Hackman should see fit to hand over only a few of Miss Reay's letters (one or two being moreover of unpleasant license), and not the great body of her correspondence. The absence of Miss Reay's letters does not help the look of Croft's case, who, we may be sure, would have withheld none of those then in his possession, but who might well hesitate to forge new ones.

Croft's thoughts ran upon literary forgeries.

In *Love and Madness* there are, besides the Chatterton story, many allusions to other similar deceits. In the Chatterton letter itself he devotes several pages to such cases. He waxes eloquent in Chatterton's behalf, and thinks forgery much too severe a name for the Rowley poems. Of De Foe he speaks as follows, at once attacking him for an act no worse than the theft of the Chatterton material, and leaving, he doubtless thought, some sort of loophole for himself:

"Had Selkirk given him his papers, there could have been no harm in working them up his own way. I can easily conceive a writer making his own use of a known fact, and filling up the outlines which have been sketched by the bold and hasty hand of fate. A moral may be added, by such means, to a particular incident; characters may be placed in their just and proper lights; mankind may be amused (and amusements, sometimes, prevent crimes), or, if the story be criminal, mankind may be bettered, through the channel of their curiosity" (p. xiii).

Distrust is inevitably invited in the case of the letter of Jan. 28, 1779, where there is a trouble with dates. Hackman writes,

"How glad am I that I have taken orders, and what obligations have I to my dear B. to Mr. H. and Dr. V.! Now, my happiness can be deferred no longer" (p. 142).

But Hackman was not ordained deacon till February 24. Mr. Burgess airily says that there must be a mistake in the date. Natural enough! but the closing paragraph of the letter warns: "Do not forget the 5th of next month. We *must* keep that day sacred together." He means Feb. 5, the anniversary of his duel. He writes, Feb. 5, 1778, "Only remember, in all our future life, each fifth of February be ever sacred." The dilemma is clear: either Hackman prevaricated—a man who later refused to prevaricate to save his life—or else a good part of the letter is not genuine.

I have not thought it worth while to go more minutely into the general question, considering technical points of sentence length, range of figures, connectives, ratios of predication, etc. Two or three surface matters of style caught my eye, but they can have no weight in the discussion: the misuse of *would* is a



fault common to the pseudo-Hackman style and that of Croft; so is the rhetorical question, which though distinctly a mark of Croft, everywhere and always, occurs infrequently in Hackman—who had real questions to ask his love.

What, at length, shall be said of the literary interest of the letters? Apart from the Chat-terton story, that of James Hackman and Martha Reay is quite worth reprinting and reading. Mr. Burgess deserves our thanks for it; for nobody ever gave the world the story of a more genuine, a more passionately sustained devotion than that of Hackman. It may be called unwise, it certainly was not without fault; but it was ethically worth a world of such long-lived liaisons as that of Lord Sandwich. Literature has hardly a more pathetic figure to show than poor Hackman at Newgate. The letters, ostensibly written from the condemned cell, bear many marks of being, at least in their main content, genuine. These moreover when published had presumably to pass the scrutiny of the Rev. Charles Parker, in whose custody they were left by Hackman. The remorse of the condemned man, the awful dream that beset him, the relief from himself that he sought in writing to Parker, are things natural and credible. Compare the following passage, which has the true, sad ring, with the similar but strained interpolation (if such it be) which is quoted above ("Should the pen of fancy, etc."):

"Were these scraps of paper to be seen by any other eye than yours, common people would wonder that, in proportion as the moment drew nearer, I got further and further from myself. It may be contrary to the rules of critics, but so it is. To think, or to write about myself, is death, is hell. My feelings will not suffer me to date these different papers any more" (p. 176).

The recital of the dream, made in Hackman's short, half-stifled sentences, has the poetry that is wrung out of human life with the bloody sweat of despair. A soul has reached the place (where many a soul has all too suddenly found itself), in which the obtrusive realities of the concrete world seem but shadows as compared with the dread facts of the spiritual world. And the letter has the awful eloquence which bursts out of supreme

human anguish when the victim tries to temper his pain by expressing it. He sees his Beloved—her face, her person cast anew in angel moulds; her mind he sees as plainly as her face, but it is not capable of alteration for the better; her whom he has sent to her account with all her foibles on her head, and these she must expiate. Over the fixt gulf between them he sees her smile at his sufferings, and bid her companion angel, too, enjoy them.

"Oh! how I rejoiced, how I wept, sobbed with joy, when I awoke, and discovered it was only a dream, and found myself in the condemned cell of Newgate."

E. H. LEWIS.

*The University of Chicago.*

#### FAUST'S FIRST MONOLOGUE AND THE EARTH-SPIRIT-SCENE IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT CRITICISM.

THE unity of thought and composition of this part of Goethe's poem has become an especial subject of discussion since the appearance in 1885 of an essay by the late Wilhelm Scherer (*Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vi, 231), in which he claimed to have discovered at this point unmistakable evidence of interruptions, omissions, and ill-concealed changes of plan on the part of the poet. Criticisms of these views of Scherer by Professor Calvin Thomas (*Goethe's Faust*, First Part, Boston: 1892) and by J. Collin (*Untersuchungen über Goethe's Faust in seiner ältesten Gestalt. I. Der erste Monolog und die Erdgeistszene*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Giessen: 1892) have suggested the following résumé and estimate of the arguments pro and con. Here, however, we do not forget that Scherer never saw Fräulein Göchhausen's copy of Goethe's early work, commonly called the *Urfaust*, discovered and published by Erich Schmidt in 1887 and again in 1888. Nor do we lose sight of the great advantage afforded the later critics, in their strictures upon Scherer's conclusions, by the absence in this earlier version of the cracks and seams suspected by their predecessor. But in absence of positive knowledge as to the time when the Göchhausen version was written, and as to how closely or loosely this may tally with the

real as yet undiscovered *Urfaust*, it by no means follows that Scherer's hypotheses need no refutation.

The following parallel arrangement of the

#### SCHERER.

##### 1. ll. 1-32.

A sort of prologue, rehearsing Faust's unsatisfactory past and thus prefacing the statement of his devotion to magic. At the end of it Scherer expects the hero to proceed straightway with his conjuring (cf. *Aufsätze über Goethe*, Berlin: 1886, pp. 310 f.).

##### 2. ll. 33-74.

A lyric passage filled with repining at the ugly contrast between the beauty and health of Nature and the cramped and musty wretchedness of this lumber-room of a study, written according to Scherer considerably later than 1 and intended originally by the poet, not as a complement of, but as a substitute for, the first passage (p. 315).

##### 3. ll. 75-114.

Contemplation of the magic symbols, prefaced by what Scherer regards as the inapposite exclamation "*Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister, neben mir*," etc., and accompanied by Faust's description of their effect upon his mind (pp. 310-311).

##### 4. ll. 115-164.

The evoking of the Earth-Spirit, a passage whose only "Unebenheit" rests according to Scherer upon the mixture of prose and verse it presents (p. 322).

First, we note a discrepancy between the subdivisions of the whole passage, indicated by Scherer and tacitly accepted by Thomas (pp. 251 f.), and those maintained by Collin. All three critics are agreed in regarding the first thirty-two lines of the monologue as a well-defined group, 1. Scherer extends the second sub-division, 2, to line 75, since he refers lines 65-74 to Faust's resolve to flee from the study into the night. Collin's radically different conception of the situation expressed in these lines and the fact that for him the exclamation: "*Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!*" is the passionate culmination of the previous reflections, lead him to regard line 66 as the beginning of the third sub-division, 3, (cf. Scherer, p. 315; and Collin, p. 18). Promising shortly to return to these points, we recall further that Scherer, though not over-confident

subdivisions of the First Monologue and the Earth-Spirit-Scene, as proposed by Scherer and by Collin, will render clearer the subsequent discussion:

#### COLLIN.

##### ll. 1-32.

A sort of prologue, rehearsing Faust's unsatisfactory past and thus prefacing the statement of his devotion to magic, interrupted by the following lyrical passage which is organically connected with the foregoing by the 'moonlight-motif' (p. 18).

##### 2. ll. 33-65.

A lyric passage rising naturally in the mind of the disciple of Rousseau, as a kind of *sotto voce* protest against the use of magic prescribed by the legend he was bound to follow, instead of direct and loving communion with Nature, dictated by his own experience and preference. Not intended by the poet as a substitute for ll. 1-32 (cf. Scherer: *Aufsätze*, pp. 315 and 320), but as a supplementary commentary upon the character of Faust (pp. 19 f.).

##### 3. ll. 66-106.

Faust's attitude toward the book of Nostradamus and resolve to turn directly from the symbols to their objects, all inspired by the young Goethe's pantheistic love of nature (pp. 22 and 25 f.). Contemplation of the sign of the Macrocosm and recital of its effect upon Faust's mind.

##### 4. ll. 107-160.

The evoking of the Earth-Spirit in two-fold fashion (pp. 44 f.).

##### 5. ll. 161-168.

Transition-monologue prefatory to the scene, *Faust and Wagner* (p. 8).

of the accuracy of this second sub-division, suspects lines 75 and 76 to be substitutes for other original lines, subsequently suppressed (p. 315 and Note), and that he extends the third portion of text to line 114, thus including eight lines assigned by Collin to the first of Faust's two attempts to evoke the Earth-Spirit (pp. 43 f.). Scherer extends the fourth division to line 164, thus overlapping part of the transition-monologue prefatory to the scene, *Faust and Wagner* (ll. 161-168), as proposed by Collin.

Scherer takes especial pains to prove two things concerning lines 1-32:

a. Their essential resemblance to the *Volksdrama* and *Puppenspiel*, and to a feature of Marlowe's *Faust*, absent from the extant versions of *Volksdrama* and *Puppenspiel*, namely, the four faculties,—a feature referable, there-



fore, according to Scherer, either to the poet's acquaintance with a version to us unknown, or to mere coincidence (p. 311).

b. Differences between 1 and 2 in content, meter, and style, so great as to warrant the assumption of the lapse of considerable time between the composition of the first and that of the second passage, and of a marked transformation in the artist, Goethe, effected in the interim (p. 320).

Scherer attributes the formal peculiarities of 1, irregular meter, familiar, archaic, or dialectic locutions, the argumentative *zwar, dafür, auch, drum, ob*, etc., to the young poet's interest in Hans-Sachs and to his translation into Hans-Sachs doggerel (*Knittelverse*) of an original prose draft of these lines (p. 321). Absence of these items in 2 is for him evidence of the intellectual and artistic progress of Goethe, who expressed his dissatisfaction with the old introduction by composing the second passage, as a substitute for 1 (p. 324). Confirmation of this view he finds in what he regards as the lack of organic connection between 2 and 3 (pp. 287 and 324). As we shall see presently, his discovery of this dissonance was materially assisted by his failure to notice the break in thought and tone, afforded by the exclamation: *Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!* This led Scherer to extend 2 beyond l. 65 to l. 75, and to look for a bridge where no bridge was needed nor intended.

Everything in the opening lines of the passage, he argues, points to Faust's intention to make a practical application in the open air of his knowledge of magic. He purposes this, because experience has demonstrated the futility of such efforts within the four walls of the study. He has never succeeded in evoking any spirits; he is still expectant and hopeful, but also unhappy. Scherer is, therefore, surprised to hear him allude to a book, which he only needs to open to feel himself at once surrounded by spirits (pp. 310 f.). He therefore supposes that Goethe intended originally to proceed as did the *Volksdrama* and *Puppen-spiel*, assisting the hero, embarrassed for want of a suitable book, by a scene in which this should be brought him, and that he subsequently wrote 2 as a substitute for 1 plus this

missing scene (p. 324). Scherer furthermore finds need either of a missing scene or of missing words to introduce the evoking of the Earth-Spirit, l. 114 (or, l. 106). For, his argument runs (p. 322), the words:

*Ich fühl's, du schwebst um mich,  
Erflehter Geist!*

are in their present context without obvious significance, since the Spirit has not yet been *erfleht* at all. He suggests the possibility that in the omitted scene Wagner interrupted Faust's attempt to evoke the Earth-Spirit, thus paving the way to a monologue in the next scene, explanatory of the hero's repeated attempts in this direction and adequately prefacing the words just quoted (p. 323).

Professor Calvin Thomas (*Goethe's Faust*, First Part, Boston: 1892, pp. 251 f.) acknowledges the ingenuity of these arguments of Scherer and feels that they prove, at least,

"that the four passages did not proceed from a continuous creative impulse, but correspond, in part at least, to different moods and to different phases of poetic feeling and of artistic power."

He supposes an interval, though not necessarily a long interval, to have elapsed between the composition of 1, and that of 2. In 2 he finds reflected not a radically different Goethe, but only a different mood from the one traceable in 1 (Cf. p. 253). The poet

"has in mind here a Faust who has spent long nights poring over magic books; who has learned to recognize and imitate their symbols, and to know what to expect from each; who has tried to evoke spirits, tried to evoke the Earth-Spirit, but in vain, the reason being, of course, that he has not had the right book. In his own mind, however, the magician has framed a different theory to account for his failure, viz., that the symbols will not do their proper work amid the 'dust and mold' of the study, but need to be taken out into the open air."

Therefore he determines to leave the house, according to Thomas, that the symbols of Nostradamus may not prove as inoperative as all the others. Still, by way of a final trial before rushing out into the night, he exclaims to the spirits whom he as magician feels to be hovering near him:

*Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister, neben mir  
Antwortet mir, wenn ihr mich hört!*



We see, therefore, that Thomas finds, as did Scherer: (a), that the four passages did not proceed from a continuous creative impulse; and (b), that an interval must have elapsed between the composition of 1 and that of 2. That he does not regard 2 as originally intended as a substitute for 1, and does not insist upon a long interval between the genesis of 1 and that of 2, distinguishes his view in degree but not in kind from that of Scherer. Their point of essential agreement is the *interruption* and *modification* of the original poetic intention, felt by both at the end of line 32. Scherer's view that the provenience of the Book of Magic originally found explanation in a scene intended to follow 1, as dramatic introduction to the conjuring scene, Thomas rejects (p. 253) as a clumsy device of the puppet-plays, no less mysterious than the book itself. "It was just as well, therefore, simply to assume that Faust has the book from the outset." (*Ibid.*) This seems to me a judicious observation, stating pithily the adequate objection to this part of Scherer's argument. But Thomas proceeds straightway to the assumption of a decided change of plan in 2, substituting for the Faust of 1, inexperienced in conjuring, a man whose initial experiment in this line is long since a matter of the past. Now, in all the mention of apparatus and books, contained in 2, there is not a syllable of evidence that Faust has hitherto used them for the purposes of Magic. His study may for years have abounded in books of magic; but his investigations have apparently hitherto all been along natural and not supernatural lines. I can find not the slightest textual warrant for Thomas' inference that the Faust of 2 is already experienced as conjuror. On the contrary, everything in the text itself seems to me to point to Faust's inexperience in the use of magic, not only in 1 but also in 2. This view is further strengthened by the form *werde* (*Urfaust*, l. 26), quoted by Thomas in connection with 1 (p. 253), in place of *würde* in the Fragment of 1790. This *werde* points vividly to something expected from a new, as yet untried, experience. And the use of *würde* in the Fragment and in the edition of 1808 by no means implies necessarily: "I have been devoting myself to magic (for some time) to see

whether many a secret *would* not be revealed to me" (cf. Thomas, p. 254). It may at least with equal propriety be translated: "Therefore I have devoted myself to magic (=have now resolved to try magic) to see whether many a secret *may* not be revealed to me." *Würde* in place of *werde* simply renders less confident the expectation of Faust and emphasizes the groping uncertainty of the situation. This last is the interpretation of Scherer, who finds confirmatory evidence of its correctness in the *nun* of the first and the fifth lines:

*Habe nun, ach! Philosophie . . . .*  
*Da steh ich nun, ich armer Thor!* (p. 312).

There is certainly nothing in the syntax of the passage that transforms the novice into the adept in matters of magic.

Now, the assumption of Thomas that Faust, after convincing himself of the inefficacy of the symbols, when employed within doors, and after resolving to try them in the open air, is sufficiently influenced by his conviction of the immediate presence of Spirits to make him remain where he is for another experiment, involves a psychological improbability that is a serious objection to this interpretation. For what is there in a long series of fruitless attempts at evoking spirits to produce such a conviction of their accessibility as to make a man, bent upon avoiding a repetition of past failure by rushing out into the night, pause in mid-career and accept again the old conditions? Another point deserving passing mention is Thomas' own theory as to the failure of the symbols in Faust's previous efforts at conjuring. He writes: ". . . the reason being, of course, that he has not had the right book" (p. 253). But there is no mention of any other Book of Magic in the whole Monologue and Earth-Spirit Scene than that of Nostradamus. This consideration and the absence of satisfactory evidence in passage 2 of even a single past attempt on the part of Faust at evoking spirits, emphasized in the foregoing considerations, render unsatisfactory this explanation of the situation. Thus Thomas seems to remove several of the difficulties felt by Scherer, by the introduction of others nearly as grave, and he accepts as real the hiatus felt by Scherer before the words:

*Ich fühl's, du schwebst um mich,  
Erregter Geist.*

This latter point is included in the following discussion.

We turn now to the argument of Collin in its application to the views under discussion. Recalling his restriction of passage 2 to lines 33-65 (cf. parallel columns) because of the change of tone, noticeable directly after the exclamation: *Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!*, we are interested in his reply to Scherer's question why Faust does not leave the study and seek the open air. This would have been entirely consistent, he says, with the mood of the nature-loving poet, but equally inconsistent with the Faust-legend, that prescribed belief in the use of Magic (p. 20). Faust as yet only partially understands the previous silent invitation of the moonlight to eschew Magic and to turn directly to Nature herself for inspiration and for guidance. His blindness to the better way, the direct approach to nature, removed for an instant while he speaks these words, is a tragic element of the traditional frame-work, to whose poetic treatment Goethe was committed (p. 22). The desirability of intimate knowledge of the secret workings of Nature Faust feels keenly, but he still believes that the highroad to this insight lies in Magic. The disciple of Rousseau had the difficult task of leading the hero of the action gradually through the long apprenticeship of Magic, prescribed by the mediæval legend, to face-to-face vision, that motives the words:

Könnst' ich Magie von meinem Pfad entfernen  
Die Zaubersprüche ganz und gar verlernen,  
Stünd ich, Natur, vor dir ein Mann allein,  
Da wär's der Mühe wert, ein Mensch zu sein.

(Weim. Ed. II. 11404 ff.).

The antipodal character of Nature and Learning Faust already feels at the opening of the drama, after years of struggle; not until disappointment, and distress, and sin, and crime have entered his life will he recognize the same relationship between Nature and Magic. (Collin, pp. 19-22.) We know that Goethe's early writings abound in glimpses of his own enthusiastic devotion to nature, as revealed in the outer world, and in proofs of his discriminating study of her varying phases. Numerous fragmentary expressions of this in letters

and sundry essays, written in the early seventies and the whole background of the Werther romance, are abundant evidence that the mood expressed in lines 33-65 was part of the young poet's habitual thought. What more natural than the change of tone after line 32, as protest of the young Nature-poet against the futility of that method of approaching Nature imposed, for the time being, by his choice of subject? A further consideration, not mentioned by Collin, that renders still more probable the main contention, is that this second passage throws such a side light upon Faust's desire to understand, and himself to employ in turn the creative method of Nature, as to lend additional significance and interest to all his subsequent dealings with magic. The lyrical tone and modified content of 2, noticed by Scherer, are what we should expect, if Collin's interpretation be correct. Besides, nothing deduced by the older critic from metrical and stylistic differences between 1 and 2 remains without adequate explanation in the light of this interpretation.

Faust's impulse to turn from books and apparatus to Nature, expressed in the words: *Flieh! Auf! hinaus ins weite Land!* is, accordingly, at once modified by the recollection of his resolve (*Urfaust*, I. 24) to try Magic, lost sight of during the musings suggested by the light of the full moon (*Urfaust*, II. 33 f.). Intimate knowledge of Nature! To be sure! But what better way to this than through Magic? And what better guide in the use of Magic than Nostradamus? By means of it Nature became to him an open book. Why not to Faust as well? Thus the words,

Und dies geheimnisvolle Buch

Ist dir es nicht Geleitz genug?

refer not to the momentary impulse to leave the study and rush forth into the night, but to Faust's serious purpose to seek Nature through Magic under the direction of the veteran magician, Nostradamus (Collin, pp. 22 f.). They constitute the transition overlooked by Scherer and also by Thomas from 2 to 3. Nature in the line,

*Wenn Natur dich unterweist,*

is Nature seen through the *Zauberbuch*, not identical with that Nature to whom Faust,



blessed for an instant with the unclouded vision of his author, would flee (*Urfaust*, I. 65). With Thomas, Collin regards as trivial the question of the provenience of the book. The whole Monologue seems to him designed to present to us Faust the scholar, tired of and disgusted with fruitless, dry-as-dust learning, determined to test magic as a means for effecting what study fails to give, and to make us witnesses of his *first* experiment in evoking spirits (p. 24). Not the presence of the volume in his library but his determination to reach Nature through Magic is significant. In view of this, how impertinent the question raised by Scherer as to where he got the book and why he had not used it before, if already in his possession!

Before opening the book, Faust reflects upon the uselessness of dry meditation upon form and meaning of the symbols in this attempt to use Magic as a road to Nature (Collin, p. 25):

*Umsonst dass trocknes Sinnen hier  
Die heil'gen Zeichen dir erklärt.*

Scherer and Thomas refer the word *hier* to the Study instead of to the Experiment, and still expect, therefore, to see Faust leave the room. Hence the former's conjecture as to suppressed originals of lines 75 and 76 (*Aufsätze*, p. 315 and Note), and the latter's unsatisfactory explanation of Faust's final decision to remain indoors. Faust determines to turn directly to the Spirits, whose symbols he shall find in the book. Collin traces this resolve directly to the young poet's conviction of the omnipresence of the spirit-world, as shown in *Mahomet*, *Clavigo*, *Werther*, *Faust*, and elsewhere (p. 26). Here the traditional conception of the spirit-world blends with the view of Goethe, so that he makes Faust allege the omnipresence of spirits as a reason for disregarding speculation and for addressing at once the substance indicated by the signs. Collin points out (p. 27) Scherer's double mistake (1), in overlooking this blending of modern conviction with ancient tradition and (2), in finding puzzling that the opening of a mere book should suddenly convince Faust of the close proximity of hovering Spirits (*Aufsätze*, pp. 310-311). The words,

*Ihr schwebt, ihr Geister, neben mir;  
Antwortet mir, wenn ich mich hört!*

*precede* the opening of the book.

Scherer finds no explanation of the word *erfleht* (*Urfaust*, I. 123) in its present context, and suspects that scenes or a scene and words, explanatory of Faust's previous vain attempts to evoke the Earth-Spirit, are for some reason missing. Thomas calls attention to this view of Scherer in a note (pp. 260-261), tacitly accepting the view of the latter. In the following we note Collin's view of the matter.

Disappointed and chagrined at his own inability to realize in actual experience the beatific vision of the creative activity of the Universe, suggested by the sign of the Macrocosm, Faust turns the leaves of the book, notes the sign of the Earth-Spirit, and feels at once his strong affinity for this Master of Earth-Life. The mistake just committed in expecting from the more remotely related Spirit-of-the-Universe what could be the result only of intimate communion with the controlling Essence of Earth-Existence, he now comprehends. He feels with a thrill of delight and accepts the challenge to enter actively into all the weal and woe of earthly experience and to contend with all the storms of life that blow, with a courage that never quails even in the face of shipwreck. In these expressions and in the words that follow them (*Urfaust*, II. 115-121), Collin finds what he calls a preliminary conjuring of the Earth-Spirit, followed according to the stage-direction by a second attempt, with an accompaniment of the traditional mummery (p. 44).<sup>1</sup> Here again Goethe's own youthful conviction of the commanding influence of spiritual affinity, subsequently reflected in *Wahlverwandtschaften*, for an instant breaks through the prescription of tradition. Gradually increasing spiritual affinity, culminating in attempted self-identification with one's recognized counterpart, is the natural magic of the situation. But after this concession to his own feeling, the poet makes Faust pronounce the mystic formula, whose use preserves the framework of the legend. This explains, according to Collin, the meaning of the word

<sup>1</sup> Kuno Fisher recognizes the first, but overlooks the second of these conjurings. Cf. *Goethe's Faust nach seiner Entstehung, Idee und Composition*. Zweiter Band, pp. 219 f. Stuttgart: 1893.



*erflehter* in line 123, and also the expression of the Earth-Spirit in line 131 f.:

*Du hast mich mächtig angezogen,  
An meiner Sphäre lang gezogen.*

Another consideration that seems to me additional proof of the correctness of this interpretation is that Faust's life has for years shown this increasing affinity for the Earth-Spirit, with no more than a dim recognition of the fact on his part. What else than this has inspired his past devotion to ascertaining the secrets of Nature? What else than this has quickened his impatience with the futility of book-knowledge as a means, and has led him to adopt what seems by contrast the direct method of Magic? This summoning of the Earth-Spirit in our presence is, therefore, merely the climax of a long continued soul-experience inferable from the words of the Monologue.

These considerations seem to meet squarely the difficulties thus far pointed out by those who find in this part of the poem traces of changed plan, interrupted composition, and missing passages or scenes. Without forgetting the possibility of new positive evidence, afforded by the future discovery of the real *Urfaust*, it is not too much to say, meanwhile, that Collin presents in his valuable dissertation a convincing array of presumptive evidence for the unity of plan and composition of this part of Goethe's Faust.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

University of Chicago.

### THE ETYMOLOGY OF *Yeoman*.

VARIOUS etymologies have been proposed for the word *yeoman*; the oldest, so far as I know, and certainly the most popular derivation, connects the first syllable with Frisian *gā*, 'a district,' and cognate equivalents, and has the weight of learning and authority in its favor. It was proposed by Spelman, and has since been adopted by Junius, Wedgwood, Skeat, and Mayhew, and *The Century*, *Webster's International*, *The Standard* and other dictionaries. Most of the other proposed etymologies may be disposed of as mere unscientific guesses; as, for instance, (a) <A.S. *guma*, 'a man'; (b) a contraction of a supposed M.E.

*yeme-man*, 'a person in charge,' <*yeme* 'care'+*man*; (c) <A.S. *gemēne*, common; (d) <A.S. *iung man*, *geong man*, 'young man,' 'vassal.'

But the accepted etymology seems to me to be open to several objections. It looks rather strange that we should be compelled to go to the continent for the original of a very common English word, with a very peculiar meaning, when the original itself is virtually never otherwise found in English, and the peculiar signification is undiscoverable on the continent. One example of an English cognate to Frisian *gā* has been found in the compound *æl-gē*, 'a province of eels,' it is true; but as Kluge has pointed out, this word, Frisian *gā*, Ger. *Gau*, except in a few compounds and in the oldest period, is foreign to the Old Norse, Saxon, and English. We may fairly say then that no English equivalent of Frisian *gā* has yet been discovered.

Again, as Mr. Mayhew has pointed out in *The Academy* (45, 498), no satisfactory explanation of the relation between the two words, Frisian *gā* and English *yeoman*, has even been successfully attempted. There are two forms in Middle English, *zeman* and *zoman*, and to quote Mr. Mayhew:

"these forms point back to an Old English \**geoman* of which the long diphthong after the palatal was pronounced *ēo* (whence *zēman*) or *eō* (whence *zōman*, *yeoman*) compare O.E. *ēode* and M.E. *gēde*, *zōde*; O.E. *sēo* and M.E. *schē*, *schō*; O.E. *hēo* ('she') and M.E. *zhē*, *zhō* and (according to the *Oxford Dictionary*) *cēocan* and M.E. *chēken*, Mod.E. *choke*."

Mr. Mayhew then endeavors to establish the relation between this Old-English *gēo* (*geō*) and Frisian *gā* by means of a Germanic base *gawja*, but against this etymology I offer my first objection,—that no *gēo* (*geō*)=Fris. *gā* can be found in English, either in simple or in compound form.

If, however, we come to Stratmann's proposed etymology—that is, <A.S. *geoman*, *iuman*, all difficulties will, I think, disappear. The phonological difficulty vanishes at once. The only plausible argument against this derivation is that of Dr. Skeat; namely, that the sense is totally unsuitable.

The first thing in its favor is the habit in Old English of compounding words with *geo*, *gio*,

*iu*. Compare *iu-monna*, *Beow*, 3052; *io-meowlan*, *Beow*, 2931; *iu-wine*, *Seef*. 92; *iu-lean*, *Wald*, 2, 7; *giomonna*, *Met*. 1, 23, etc., etc. That the word compounded with *iu*-(*io*-) may be used of the living, the example from *Beowulf* proves. Earle translates it "wife of one's youth;" Grein, "Greisinn." So *yeo-man* need not necessarily signify 'a forefather, ancestor,' but it may also mean 'an old man, ancient,' and like the word "ancient" it took on the signification 'a very old man, an elder of the village.' A few facts from constitutional history will, I am inclined to think, establish this theory.

The *ceorl* of the Anglo-Saxon is the *yeoman* of the Middle-English period. (Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, i, 84.) Or, as Hallam has stated the case, *Middle Ages*, ii, 70,

"Nobody can doubt that the *villani* and *bordarii* of Domesday Book, who are always distinguished from the serfs of the demesne, were the *ceorls* of Anglo-Saxon law. And I presume that the *socmen*, who so frequently occur in that record, though far more in some counties than in others, were *ceorls* more fortunate than the rest, who by purchase had acquired freeholds, or by prescription and the indulgence of their lords, had obtained such a property in the outlands allotted to them that they could not be removed, and in many instances might dispose of them at pleasure. They are the root of a noble plant, the free socage tenants or yeomanry whose independence has stamped with peculiar features both our institutions and our national character."

Stubbs (*Constitutional History*, iii, 551), speaking of "the great body of freeholders, the yeomanry of the Middle Ages," characterizes it as "a body which, in antiquity of possession and purity of extraction, was probably superior to the classes that looked down upon it as ignoble."

But one of the changes brought about by the Norman Conquest was the reduction of the *ceorl* almost if not quite to a state of servitude. He became attached to the land, and he was finally left virtually without civil rights towards his lord. At the same time, the *theow* of Anglo-Saxon law, the serfs of the demesne were somewhat lifted in the social scale, and in process of time the *servus* or *theow* disappeared altogether. (Cf. Stubbs, i, 428 ff.) Both classes were designated villeins by the Norman lawyers. But though they

came so close to each other as to require the trained mind of the jurist, or the constitutional historian, to distinguish between them, yet among themselves the distinction was never lost sight of.

"Not but that, if it came to a question of law, the local witness might in each case draw a distinction as to the status of the villein concerned; the testimony of the township or the hundred might prove that this man was descended from a family which had never been free, this from a bought slave, this from a commended *ceorl*." Stubbs, i, 429.

In Old-English law the yeoman was *probus et legalis homo*, one having free land of forty shillings by the year (previously five nobles), who was thereby qualified to serve on juries, vote for knights of the shire, and do any other act for which the law required this status or position. It was from the younger brothers of the yeoman families that the households of the great lords were recruited: they furnished men at arms, archers and hobelers, to the royal force at home and abroad, and, settling down as tradesmen in the cities, formed one of the links that bound the urban to the rural population. (Stubbs, iii, 551.) Later the tenant farmers were added to the yeoman class,—all of which serves to explain the extension of the use of the word in its various meanings.

W. M. BASKERVILL.

Vanderbilt University.

## GERINELDO II.<sup>1</sup>

It was long or seven years had an end  
She longd fu sair her love to see

'For I maun marry my first true love,  
That's done and suffered so much for me.'  
Ballada de Young Beichan.

1 Bibliographia do presente artigo:

- Almeida-Garrett, João Bapatista visconde de, *Romanceiro*, t. ii e iii, Lisboa 1851.  
Child, Francis James, *The English and Scottish popular Ballads*, 8 parts, Boston 1882-1892.  
Durán, D. Agustín, *Romanceiro General*, 2 vol., Madrid 1859, 2a edição.  
*Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie*, publicado sob a direcção de G. Groeber, Strassburg, 1888, sq.  
*Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, vol. iii, 1861.  
Mil i y Fontanals, D. Manuel, *Obras Completas*, coleccionadas por el Dr. D. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, t. i-v, Barcelona 1888-1893.



AHI vai a continuação d'um ensaio folklórico que eu publiquei na caderneta de Dezembro de 1892 d'esta mesma revista (vol. vii, cols. 449-485) com o titulo de "La tradition d'Eginhard et Emma dans la poésie romanesca de la péninsule Hispanique," do qual se fez tambem uma *separata* em numero limitado. Formáram então o objecto das minhas observações os romances de *Gerineldo*, tão populares nos paizes de lingua castelhana, catalã e portugueza. Estes romances, assentados elles proprios n'uma tradição do cyclo carolingeo, achão-se aparentados pelo fundo, ou connexos pelas suas ramificações, com outros varios grupos de romances, dos quaes mencionei alguns na conclusão d'aquelle artigo (vii, col. 483).

Se hoje imprehendo seguir na minha tarefa, passando revista dos romances dependentes dos de *Gerineldo*, é principalmente graças á particular acolhida que fizéram á minha primeira publicação o Snr. G. Paris no seu juizo critico na 'Romania,' vol. xxiii, p. 307, e o illustrado conservador da Bibliotheca Nacional de Lisboa, José Leite de Vasconcellos Pereira de Mello, na *Revista Lus.*, vol. iii, p. 375.

Antes de entrar no proprio assumpto do presente artigo, que versará sobre a segunda parte dos romances de *Gerineldo*, peço licença para completar nalguns pontos o meu trabalho anterior, pelos seguintes

#### ADDENDA.

*Chapitre Ier.*—O Snr. G. Paris chama a attenção para o facto de eu não ter conseguido descobrir a origem dos romances de *Gerineldo*, e continúa:

"Cette source est certainement une chroni-

Milá y Fontenals, *Romancerillo Catalán*, Barcelona, 1882.

Munthe, Ake W: son, *Folkpoesi från Asturien*, i, Upsala, 1888.

Nigra, Costantino, *Canti popolari del Piemonte*, Torino, 1888.

Paris, Gaston, *Les chants populaires du Piémont*, Paris, 1890.

Pidal, Juan Menendez, *Colección de . . . Romances . . . asturianos*, Madrid 1885.

*Revista Lusitana*, volumes ii e iii, Porto, 1890-1895.

Santa-Anna Nery, F.-J. de, *Folk-lore Brésilien*, Paris, 1889.

Wolf, Ferdinand, *Proben Portugiesischer und spanischer Volksromenzen*, Vienna, 1856.

Wolf y Hofmann, *Primavera y Flor de Romances*, 2 tomos, Berlin, 1856.

que et non une tradition populaire;<sup>2</sup> il doit y avoir moyen de savoir quelle chronique contenant l'histoire en question a pu être connue d'un poète espagnol du xvie siècle."

Segundo expuz no *chap. Premier*, não exta nos reinos de Hispanha versão prosaica do *Gerineldo* anterior ao seculo decimo oitavo (vii, col. 455), e o romance, muito mais velho, provirá d'algum conto das chronicas ou *livres savants* francezes, baseado principalmente no *Chronicon Laureshamense* (vii, cols. 452, 454), mas emprestando varios rasgos d'outras fontes da tradição (vii, cols. 477, 478, 481). Tocante pois ao problema de descobrir aquel conto posterior á chronica de Lorsch que subministrou o prototypo dos romances de *Gerineldo*, força me é declarar que não disponho presentemente dos materiaes indispensaveis para tal investigação.

Emquanto á variante mais antiga dos romances de *Gerineldo*, vêja-se a minha tentativa de classificação, vol. vii, col. 475. Para podermos determinar com maior certeza a lição primordial, primeiro sim que precisaríamos conhecer exactamente a redacção adoptada pela nossa lenda na chronica na qual o romance foi haurido directamente.

*Chapitre ii.*—Para a classificação geral dos romances de *Gerineldo*, comparem-se as observações de C. M. de Vasconcellos, na sua *Historia da Litteratura Portugueza*.<sup>3</sup> Nos seus *Estudos sobre o Romancerio Peninsular*,<sup>4</sup> a mesma sabia da, á occasião d'uma analyse critica da *Folkpoesi* de Munthe, uma enumeração das lições do *Gerineldo*, acompanhada d'uma valiosa bibliographia romanesca de vinte e sete numeros.

O Snr. J. Leite escreve (*Rev. Lusit.* iii, p.

<sup>2</sup> A theoria das *chronicas* como fonte de romances encontra-se ventilada tambem nos *Chants pop. du Piémont*, pp. 28, 29: "Les... romances... d'Eginardo... dérivent sans doute du *Chronicon Laureshamense*, et n'ont pu se former qu'à la suite de la lecture de livres savants,"—e, mais arriba, na pag. 28, onde o Snr. Paris formula o seu conceito com relação ao *Canto di Donna Lombarda*, para refutar certa theoria do Snr. Cos. Nigra: "Il suffit qu'un poète populaire ait entendu raconter, au xvie ou au xviiie siècle, la tragique aventure de Ravenne, puis, dans le récit de Paul Diacre et les nombreux histoires qui s'en sont inspirées pour qu'il ait pu composer la belle chanson qu'on connaît."

<sup>3</sup> No *Grundriss* vol. ii, 2da secção, p. 155.

<sup>4</sup> *Rev. Lusit.* ii, pp. 192 sq.—Esse artigo não me era conhecido no tempo que publiquei o meu; cf. a minha 'note 41,' *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, vii, p. 232.



375): "A's versões portuguesas indicadas pelo Sr. Otto, posso addicionar mais duas publicadas nos meus *Romances populares portugueses*, Barcellos 1881, nos xxiii e xxiv. Também ouvi em Tras-os-Montes uma versão em hespanhol."—

Nas seguintes paginas, as designações taes como A1, C5, remetem o leitor ás correspondentes versões do *Gerineldo* no meu artigo "La tradition d'Eginhard."

A4.—Note-se o juizo de Wolf,<sup>5</sup> quem falla da 'abenteuerlich verballhornte (Katastrophe) der jüngerer castilischen Romanze [=A4], in der der Einfluss der italienischen Rittergedichte unverkennbar ist.' Elle prefere o pathetico episodio final da versão de Almeida-Garrett [=C1, a unica portugueza que conhecia], bem que vislumbre n'elle [com razão] uma interpolação posterior.

A5.—O *rifacimento* moderno em castelhano A5, extando sómente como folheto solto e não encontrando-se impresso em nenhuma colecção de romances, faço-o seguir ahi *in extenso*.

#### CANCIÓN NUEVA DEL GERINELDO,

en la que se expresan los amores y fuga de un oficial ruso con la bella Enilda, sultana favorita del Gran Señor.

- I. Se hallaba en Constaninopla  
un joven ruso lucido,  
al rervicio del Sultán,  
siendo de todos querido :
- 5 Gerineldo se llamaba  
este oficial distinguido,  
y por su heroico valor  
logró el nombre de aguerrido.
- II. El gran Señor le tenia  
10 un afecto decidido,  
estando ya tan prendado  
de su gallardía y brío,  
que para mas demostrarlo  
le confirió el gran destino
- 15 de capitán de su guardia,  
y secretario efectivo.
- III. Con todos estos honores  
estaba muy complacido,  
hasta que vino á turbarlo  
20 el rapaz, niño Cupido ;

<sup>5</sup> *Proben*, p. 57.

pues viendo á la hermosa Enildas,  
que era en belleza un prodigio,  
la Sultana favorita  
del gran Sultán, quedó herido.

- IV. 25 Una hermosa mañana  
de Mayo alegre y florido,  
por el jardin paseaba  
Gerineldo pensativo :  
á poco que habia andado  
30 se encontró con el hechizo  
atractivo de su amor,  
y de esta suerte la dijo :
- V. —Tu belleza, gran señora,  
me tiene de amor rendido,  
35 y mi pecho os adora  
con el mas fino cariño ;  
pero no porque os ame,  
como os declaro atrevido,  
se ofenda vuestra hermosura,  
40 dejándome en el olvido.
- VI. —Gerineldo, Gerineldo,  
Gerineldito querido ;  
bien conozco que el amor  
te ha hecho tan atrevido ;  
45 mas no creas que por eso  
caigas jamás en olvido  
de quien tiernamente te ama  
hace tiempo sin decirlo.
- VII. —Bella Enildas, tu respuesta  
50 me ha dejado sumergido  
en un mar de pensamientos,  
sin lograr seguro asilo ;  
pues noto la diferencia  
que va de tu culto al mio,  
55 y no abandono mi ley  
por tu amor, ni mi destino.
- VIII. —No desmayes, Gerineldo,  
que amor todo lo ha vencido ;  
estoy de tí enamorada,  
60 y esto basta, dueño mio ;  
pero has de ser reservado  
á cuanto ahora te digo ;  
hablarte esta noche quiero  
en este jardin sombrío.
- IX. 65 —Verdad es de que amor vence,  
pues tiene gran poderío,  
y expondré hasta mi existencia  
si tal fortuna consigo :  
mas siendo criado vuestro  
70 creo que os burlais conmigo.

¿A qué hora de la noche  
cumplireis lo prometido?

X. —Entre las doce y la una,  
que estará el Sultan dormido;

75 para tal hora te espero,  
que vendrás bien prevenido:  
tres vueltas da á su palacio,  
pero siempre con sigilo,  
las botas lleva en la mano,  
80 y no serás de él sentido.

XI. Eternas fueron las horas  
para el amante rendido:  
deseando por instantes  
verse con su amor unido:  
85 cumplió fielmente la cita,  
resuelto, animoso y fino,  
y entró al cuarto de la dama  
sin ser de nadie sentido.

XII. El Sultan quiere vestirse,  
90 mas no encuentra su vestido;  
que llamen á Gerineldo,  
que es su oficial mas querido:  
unos dicen que no estaba  
otros que no habia venido,  
95 y el Gran Señor receloso,  
se levantó conedido.

XIII. Al saberlo Gerineldo;  
se quedó despavorido,  
todo confuso y turbado,  
100 creyéndose ya perdido:  
la sultana lo animaba,  
y él respondió afligido:  
¡já dónde iré, mi hermosura!  
¡já dónde me iré, Dios mio!

XIV. 105 —No te aflijas, Gerineldo,  
que siempre estaré contigo:  
márchate por el jardin,  
que luego al punto te sigo:  
obedeció á la sultana,  
110 haciendo lo que le dijo,  
y el Sultan que está en acecho  
se hizo el enconradizo.

XV. —¿A dónde vas, Gerineldo?  
¿cómo estás tan pensativo?

115 —Recorriendo aquestas matas  
por ver si han florecido;  
y una rosa muy fragante  
el calor me la ha comido.  
—Mientes, mientes, Gerineldo,  
120 como villano atrevido.

XVI. Estando en esto el Sultan  
un gran pliego ha recibido;  
ábrelo y en el instante  
todo el color ha perdido.

125 —Que prendan á Gerineldo,  
y encierren en un castillo:  
marchando determinado  
á cumplir lo contenido.

XVII. Entonces la hermosa Enildas,  
130 acude á aquel mismo sitio,  
infórmase muy en breve,  
y conociendo el peligro,  
sin esperar á que vuelva  
el Sultan enfurecido,  
135 salta la verja ligera,  
guiada del ciego niño.

XVIII. Fúgase á la gran Tartaria  
con su amante y fiel amigo,  
en dos fogosos caballos,  
140 mudando traje y vestido,  
y con las joyas que lleva  
en un rico cofrecillo,  
una vida regalada  
á su dueño ha prometido.

A7, C1e Chap. iii, b, 5 (col. 477).—Com os  
versos 39-41 da versão 4 de Pidal (=A7)

Buscaba el Rey las espadas,  
las espadas de más filo:  
cogiera el Rey la dorada....,

e o verso 59 da lição de Garrett (=C1)

Tira el rei seu punhal de oiro,

confrontem-se os seguintes que saco do canto  
quadragésimo da collecção de Nigra, intitula-  
do *Il Moro Saracino*. Na variante 'A,'  
linha 13 lê-se:

O tirè-me giù mia speja,  
cula del pùgnal d'or fin

(=deitai-me abaixo a minha espada, aquella  
co'o punhal d'oro fino); na lição 'D,' l. 7  
falla-se da *spadinha cun òl pùgnal d'argent*,  
e a variante 'E,' l. 8 parece-me que apresenta  
o melhor texto, dizendo:

Campè-me giù la mia spadinha  
cun òl so pum andorà

(=atirai-me abaixo a minha espada com o  
punho dourado). Allude-se á agudeza da  
arma na versão 'B,' l. 9:

O duncè-me la mia speja,  
cula del fil 'n po' pi sutil

(=aquella com o fio um pouco mais agudo).

**A9 e note 41.**—Os já citados *Estudos* da Srta C. M. de Vasconcellos trazem uma análise da introdução apocrypha d'este romance.<sup>6</sup> Antes de resumil-a, transcrevo os treze versos em questão:

Mes de mayo, mes de mayo,  
mes de mayo, mes de flores,  
cuando los toritos brabos,  
cuando los recios calores,  
5 cuando los inamorados  
gozaban de sus amores . . . .  
Quando Gerineldo yiba  
á dar agua á sus caballos  
á los corrientes del mar.  
10 Mientras el caballo bebe  
Gerineldo echó un cantar.  
La Infanta desde lo oye  
le encomenzó á llamar . . .

[segue:—Gerineldo, Gerineldo,  
15 mi camarero benlno, etc.].

Este preludio compõe-se de tres remendos diversos. O primeiro trecho (1-6; assonancia *ô-e*) é tirado 'do celeberrimo e melancolico Romance do *Prisioneiro*' ou d'um simples '*Romance de Maio*, do genero dos que foram accrescentados ao Romance do *Prisioneiro*.' Comparem-se os versos 37-40, 43-44 do nº 372 del 'Romancero Gral' de Durán:

Mes de mayo, mes de mayo,  
cuando las recias calores,  
cuando los toros son bravos,  
los caballos corredores; . . .  
cuando los enamorados  
regalan á sus amores,

e tambem os numeros 1453, 1-4 e 1454 1-2, 5-6.

Para o segundo centão (7-11; ass. *â*) a recitadora aproveitou-se d'uns versos dos romances do *Conde-Niño*, ou *Pedro Menino*, on *Dom Diniz*, etc. Cf., por exemplo, Da Veiga, *Romanceiro do Algarve*, p. 65 (*Dom Diniz*):

1 Já se li vai Dom Diniz  
3 ver dar agua ao seu cavallo  
4 lá para as ribas do mar;  
9 em quanto o russo bebia,  
10 elle se p'z a cantar,—

Almeida-Garrett, *Rom.* iii, p. 19 (*Conde Nillo*), v. 1-4:

Conde Nillo, conde Nillo  
seu cavallo vai banhar;  
em quanto o cavallo bebe,  
armou um lindo cantar—

e Braga, *Romanceiro Geral*, nº 14 1-4, Pidal, *Roman. Astur.* nº 25 3-8, 26 3-6.

<sup>6</sup> *Rev. Lus.* ii, pp. 194-196.

A terceira parcella, de duas linhas apenas (12, 13; ass. *â*), provem d'um dos romances do segundo cyclo de *Gerineldo*, e está calcada sobre os versos 5,6 (ou 90, 91) do nº ii b da *Folkpoesi* de Munthe.—

Resta dizer duas palavras acerca do falso remate da lição de Munthe (linhas 82-85; ou, sem contar a exposição apocrypha: 69-72<sup>7</sup>). Eis a copla:

Tengo juramento hecho,  
á la Birgen de la Estrella,  
mujer que ha sido mi dama  
de no me casar con ella.

Este 'rabo-leva postiço e muito vulgar,' na origem uma *copla solta* com *rima* nas linhas 2 e 4, 'faz hoje parte de uma versão, inédita, da *Galancina*, cujo teor se aproxima muito da lição publicada por Durán (nº 329),' e parece-se tambem ao final do romance de *Tenderina*, v. Pidal, nº 8,8

**C1.**—Além das versões de *Gerineldo* que commentei, ha outra brasileira recolhida no estado de Minas-Geraes, da qual Santa-Anna Nery traz uma traducção franceza de 160 linhas curtas ou versos, no seu *Folk-lore Brésilien*, pp. 17-22:

1,2 Reginaldo, Reginaldo,  
page ch'ri du roi, etc.

Um exame d'esta lição luso-brazileira, que no meu primeiro tractado interpôr-se-hia entre as lições C1 e C2, prova que é apenas uma variante da de Garrett, com levissimas modificações (v. 29: mulâtreses; v. 42: *vieux* roi ?);

<sup>7</sup> Cf. a 'note 29' do meu "Eginhard et Emma," e cols. 464, 465.

<sup>8</sup> O distincto romanista sueco Ake W: son Munthe, a quem devemos a publicação d'esta versão (A9) do *Gerineldo*, parece que tem morrido recentemente. A Srta de Vasconcellos escreve-me que, ha annos, nem ella nem outros sabios t'm recebido d'elle resposta alguma ás suas cartas e pedidos. Na *Rev. Lusit.* o sr. Gonçalves Vianna tem-se occupado (i, 279-285) das suas *Anteckningar om Folkmalet i en trakt af vestra Asturien*, Upsala 1887, e a srta C. M. de Vasconcellos ainda mais detidamente (ii 156-179 e 193-208) dos dezasete romances archivados na sua *Folkpoesi från Asturien*, i, Upsala 1888. A segunda parte d'esta publicação, *Korta visor*, e a terceira, *Barnvisor och barnrim*, pareceram em 1889. Ademas Munthe deu duas contribuições para o *Recueil de mémoires philologiques présenté à M. G. Paris par ses élèves su dois le 9 août 1889*, a saber: "Observations sur les compos's espagnols du type *aliaberto*," e: "*Romance de la tierra*, chanson populaire asturienne," assim que um artigo, "Vermischte spanische Beiträge," na *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, vol. xv (1891).



a unica notavel é a falta do episodio do conselho e juizo dos condes (=C1 97-104).

Nestas circunstancias é força dizer em justificação da lição C1, que evidentemente o grande *acconciatore di romanze*, Almeida-Garrett, não se permittiu as numerosas al terações mais ou menos arbitrarías, que se suppunha. Pois se este romance verdadeiramente vive na bôca das povoações brasileiras, não se poderá crêr que fosse importado pelo 'Romanceiro' de Garrett, senão unicamente pela tradição oral dos immigrants portuguezes de data anterior.

C1b (cols. 468, 469), C4, e Chap. iii, c, 10 (col. 481) deveria mencionar-se a definição que Almeida-Garrett<sup>9</sup> da do *soláo* como genero de poesia popular. "É um canto epico ornado, em que as effusões lyricas acompanhão a narrativa de tristes successos, mais para gemer e chorar sôbre elles, do que para os contar ponto por ponto."

Col. 481:—Tambem F. Wolf<sup>10</sup> compara o episodio do carcere com o romance catalão "O poder do canto," do qual traz uma traducção allemã.<sup>11</sup> Emquanto a similhaça desta scena com as versões do *Conde Nillo*, etc., veremos mais adiante.

Note 62.—Outro testemunho da popularidade de *Gerineldo* encontra-se na primeira d'uma serie de coplas soltas, que formão uma especie de canção burlesca,<sup>12</sup> e foram publicadas por D. Tomas Segarra, nas *Poesías populares*, Leipzig 1852, p. 163. Eil-a ahi :

La madre de Gerineldo  
llora con grande dolor,  
Gerineldo de mi alma,  
Gerineldo de mi amor.

Esta *cuarteta* recorda o pranto da mãe na scena do carcere (em C1b).

Nos *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, philosophisch-historische Klasse, vol. 16, anno de 1855, F. Wolf publicou um estudo sobre a *Comedia famosa de la reina Maria* de Lope de Vega, a qual se nunca imprimiu e cujo autógrapho,

9 *Rom.* ii, pp. 128, 129.

10 *Proben*, p. 57, nota.

11. *Proben*, pp. 129, 130.

12 E aproximação-se do *amphiguri*. Cf. *Rev. Lusit.* ii, p. 95: 'amphiguri é uma poesia popular em que, para rir, as ideias se apresentão desconexas.'

antes na bibliotheca do Duque de Osuna, se acha agora na do Principe de Metternich. Nella, D. Guillen, na sua relação ao rei D. Pedro (ii, o Catholico, de Aragão) diz (p. 261):

Salgo entonces de las matas,  
¡pardios! como un *Gerineldo* . . .

d'onde Wolf infere, visto o conjuncto da situação, que em tempos de Vega o nosso heroe era proverbial com a ideia accessoria do 'atrevido.' (Tambem uma cópia do romance, que veio do Porto, trazia por titulo 'Girinaldo o atrevido',<sup>13</sup> e o mesmo sobrenome apparece em C1 4 e na lição luso-brazileira, l. 4: *l'audacieux*; cf. A5 8: *aguerrido*).

Note 64.—Em 1893 pareceu no Porto o *Cancioneiro de Musicas Populares para canto e piano*, por Cesar das Neves, coordenada a parte poetica por Gualdino de Campos, prefaciado pelo ex<sup>mo</sup> snr. Sr. Theophilo Braga. Cf. *Rev. Lusit.* iii, pp. 190-192.—Note-se um juizo da snra C. M. de Vasconcellos:<sup>14</sup> "Der als Musikforscher namhafte, in litterarischen Fragen aber höchst unsolide Sorianio Fuertes."

Note 67.—Para os instrumentos de musica vêja-se tambem Milá y Fontanals, na *Romania*, tomo vi (1877), p. 56, ou nas *Obras Completas*, t. v, p. 375.—

Passando agora aos romances que contão a segunda parte dos amores de *Gerineldo*, advirto que vou dar o meu commento prescindindo de uma investigação da origem d'estes romances, como a deixo esposta a largos traços para a primeira secção,<sup>15</sup> sendo ella indispensavel naquelle caso por causa das questões que levanta a sua importação forasteira.

Eis pois o que tenho que dizer respeito á Segunda Secção do Romance de Gerineldo, ou sêja :

#### A INFANTA PEREGRINA E GERINELDO.

Entre as versões do romance de *Gerineldo* commentadas na "Tradition d'Éginhard" ha algumas que com a original aventura do heroe fundem outra inteiramente independente. Ainda este episodio adicional apresenta feições muito divergentes nas varias lições, como

13 Cf. Almeida-Garrett, *Rom.* ii, p. 165.

14 No *Grundriss*, vol. 2a secção, p. 166.

15 MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, columnas 451-456.

ver-se-ha das seguintes analyses.

A lição C1b, assim que a sua variante brasileira, annexa ao corpo do romance o episodio principiando

'Já o mettem n'uma torre,  
já o vão incarcerar.'

Almeida-Garrett, *Rom.* ii, p. 172 e Hardung, *Romanceiro Portuguez* i, p. 113. Trinta e dois pares de linhas (versos 105-168): assonancia á, á excepção dos desaseis versos 137-152 (ão), de que facto não ha necessariamente que inferir que o texto esteja corrompido.<sup>16</sup>

Já trouxemos (vol. vii, cols. 468, 469 e 481) o argumento d'este romance: a incarceration de *Reginaldo*, a intervenção da mãe, o *solão* do 'pobre sem ventura, a quem el-Rei escuta e liberta para fazel-o casar com a Infanta.

Outro motivo, que representa a verdadeira segunda parte dos amores de *Gerineldo*, vem tratado nos seguintes romances, todos castelhanos-asturianos:

1. 'Romance de Gerineldo.'  
Grandes guerras se publican  
de España con Portugal

*Jahrbuch*, vol. iii (1861), p. 290. Versão de vinte e sete pares de linhas (ou, sem o falso remate: vinte e cinco), recitada a Amador de los Rios por Maria del Rosario Fernandez Gamonada (ou Gamonede), natural de Luearca (Asturias). Assonancia á-e.

Traducção allemã de Paul Heyse, no *Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 295.

*Argumento*.—Depois de estalar a guerra, Gerineldo é nomeado capitão general (1-4), e diz á Princeza que póde casar se elle não voltar aos sete annos (5-8). Os sete abriles paixão, ella pede licença a seu pae para o sahir a buscar, anda por tres 'reinados' e, ao voltar, topa com um rico vacale (9-16).

Dialogo:—Vaquerito, vaquerito,  
por la santa Trenidade,  
que me niegues la mentira,  
que me digas la verdade.  
¿De quién es esa vacada . . . ?

Tendo sabido que pertence a Gerineldo

que aquí está para casarse,

da *una moneda* ao vaqueiro, e faz-se levar á casa festiva (17-28).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. a observação da snra C. M. de Vasconcellos, *Rev. Lusit.* ii, p. 206, "A Barba Azul."

Dialogo:—Gerineldo, Gerineldo,  
una limosnita daime . . .

Ella recebe dous maravidis da mão do seu antigo amante e intima-lhe que faz mesquinha esmola

para la que en mi palacio  
antaño solias dare! (29-36).

Dialogo:—Pelegrina ¿eres el diablo  
que me vienes á tentare?

A Princeza assevera ser sua esposa legitima e prova-o por meio d'um 'papel' que lhe ensina: Gerineldo reconhece-a e vae casar com ella (37-44). Os dous noivos mandão apparelhar os coches e desatão a cantar, acautelando os seus cavallos de não beberem a agua do mar [!] (45-54).

2. Grandes guerras se publican  
entre España y Portugal.

Pidal, *Rom. Astur.*, no. 5b. Recitado em Grado (Asturias) por José Fernandez, natural de Santianes de Molenes. Vinte e seis pares de linhas, assonancia á.

Gerineldo, capitão general (4), despede-se da *Infantina* (5-8); . . . ella veste-se de romeira e encontra a um rabadão (9-16). Quando aprende que Gerineldo está para casar, cae desmaiada (17-24); conteúdo de 25-28 = 1. Ella pede esmola e Gerineldo encarrega-a de dizer á *Princesina* que já póde casar (29-36).

Dialogo:—'Romera, ¿eres el demonio . . . ?'

Ella da-se a conhecer, accrescentando porém que a boda será por D<sup>a</sup> Elvira, e que ella se hade retirar n'um convento.

—No será así, Princesina,  
contigo quiero casar. (37-46).

Os amantes reconciliados partem

para celebrar las bodas  
en Francia la natural. (47-52).

3. Fué publicada la guerra  
en Francia y en Portugal.

Munthe, *Folkpoesi*, n<sup>o</sup> 2b (=2, 86-147). Recitado em Cangas de Tineo por Antonia Coque, oriunda de Posada de Rengos (Asturias). Trinta e um pares de linhas, ass. á.

Capitão general (1-4 ou 86-89); a Infanta começa a chorar (5,6):

Gerineldo, Gerineldo,  
¿cu 'nto tiempo has de tardar? . . . (7-12 ou 92-97).

Sete annos, etc., (15 ou 100): 'se bistió de

pelegrina,' encontra uma 'bacada' e uma 'buyada' (13-22 ou 98-107). O dialogo

(23 ou 108) Díme, díme, baquerillo,  
dinero te tengo á dar . . .

contem alguns insulsos modernismos :

(29 ou 114) —Siñora, es de Gerineldo,  
está en b'spuras de casar,  
en la Carrera del Perro,  
en la casa principal,  
numaro seis, gran siñora  
esta es la pura berdá (23-34 ou 108-119).

O dialogo entre a peregrina e a gente da casa apresenta mais umas interpolações hodiernas :

(35-38 ou 120-123) —¡Ave Maria puríssima !  
—¡Sin pecado original!  
—¿podrán dar una limosna  
por la santa 'Ternidad?'<sup>17</sup>

*Él mismo* lhe sae a dar *un rial de plata* ;—

(45 ou 130) —¿Dónde es V., la romera . . . ?  
(47 ou 132) —De Castilla soy, señor . . .  
(49 ou 134) ¿Tan desconocida soy  
que no me conoces ya ?

Dialogo entre as duas rivas :

(51 ou 136) ¡Atrás, atrás la romera . . . !  
(55 ou 140) —Atrás, atrás la siñora . . . ?  
(57 ou 142) —que si V. es hija de un conde  
yo soy de un rey que anda es mas.

A quadra final (59-62 ou 144-147)

—Quédense con Dios, señores  
y alcalde d'este lugar,  
que los amores primeros  
son muy malos de olvidar—

parece indicar que os antigos amantes partem reconciliados, despedindo-se de improviso Gerineldo dos convidados reunidos para presenciar a sua boda com a segunda noiva. As palavras é verdade que são susceptíveis d'outra interpretação, que é que, pronunciadas pela Infanta, seriam o seu postreiro adeus ao infiel amante e aos hospedes d'elle.

Deitemos agora uma rapida olhada sobre alguns romances que, sem terem conservado o nome do protagonista, trazem essencialmente a mesma aventura. O primeiro d'elles é castelhano e chama o heroe *Conde Sol* ; o outro com as suas variantes é catalão (ou semi-catalão), e appellida-o com diferentes nomes.

4. "Romance caballeresco del Conde (del)Sol,"

Grandes guerras se publican  
entre España y Portugal.

<sup>17</sup> Não se deve entender 'Eternidade,' senão 'Trindade'  
—cf. *Rev. Lusit.*, ii, p. 197.

Durán, *R. Gral.*, nº 327 ; e *Primavera*, nº 135 (vol. ii, p. 48). Romance antigo tradicional, artisticamente refundido ; ainda se conserva e passa de bôca em bôca na Andaluzia e terra de Ronda. Sessenta e um pares de linhas, assonantes em *â-e*. O Conde Sol, capitão general, despede-se d'el-Rei e de sua jovem esposa desfeita em pranto (1-14). A Condeza vai buscal-o na Italia e na França ; vaccada (15-36). Interrogatorio sobre o dono das vacas, dos trigos, das ovelhas, dos cordeiros, jardins e cavallos :

—y ¿quién es aquella dama  
que un hombre abrazando escae?  
—La desposada señoira  
con que el Conde va á casare. (37-64).

A Condeza veste o grosseiro saial do vaqueiro e faz-se levar ao portal para pedir esmola (65-74). Reconhecimento (75-102) e partida dos amantes sobre um cavallo ricamente caparaçoado, para o castello onde o Conde *es señor naturale* (103-118), deixando a noiva mal parada, despojada dos seus enfeites nupciaes e sem casar (119-122).

5. 'La boda interrumpida.'

Las guerras son publicadas  
las de Fransa [y] Portugal.

Milá y Fontanals, *Rillo Cat.* nº 244, lição A ; trinta e treis pares de linhas, assonancia *â*.

Ao Conde *Don Bueso*, filho do *Conde Don Burgos*

l'han cridat per general. (1-4).

Despedida (4-14). Passados os sete annos o pae desêja que a Condeza torne a casar ; ella refusa, vae em busca do Conde, descansa traz d'uma torre e vê passar a uns pagesinhos (15-32).

Dialogo :—¿Aquesta cavallería  
por que la quieren ensellí ?  
—Pel fill del Conde Don Burgos  
qu'esta nit se quiere esposí,

etc. (33-40).—Esmola ; o Conde pergunta por novas da Italia e de sua mulher ; ella descobre-lhe a sua identidade por um *anell d'or* e o rico *faldellí* que trazia no dia da boda (41-60). Reconciliação (61-66).

5.B. El Rey n'ha fet f3 unas cridas  
per Espanya y Portugal.

*Ibidem.*—trinta e um pares de linhas, ass. *â*.

O heroe é *Don Lombardo Ramire*. A *senyora* ou *dama* faz-se acompanhar de criados



e encontra a um pagem cerca d'uma fonte de-  
frente d'uma cidade. Dialogo com o pagem,  
depois com o Conde :

39 sq :— Deu lo guart, lo senyor Comte,  
jem voldria fé una c'ritat ?  
yo vinch de d'allí d'Italia,  
l'entendiment m'ha faltat.—

#### Reconhecimento.—

Das outras versões C-G, todas fragmenta-  
rias no *Romancerillo* e assonantes em á, terei  
que dizer algumas palavras mais adiante.

(E: El Conde de Berjullita

á la guerra te d'aní . . .

F: Las guerras se son cridadas

por Francia y á Portugal . . .).

Entro agora na confrontação dos elementos  
constitutivos.

#### OS PERSONAGENS.

O protagonista *Gerineldo* 1, 2, 3, de humilde  
pagem que é nos romances do primeiro cyclo,  
é promovido<sup>8</sup> á dignidade de capitão general,  
e as versões congéneres substituem ao seu  
nome o de *Conde (del) Sol* 4, *Conde Don*  
*Bueso*, filho do *Conde Don Burgos* 5A, *Don*  
*Lombardo Ramire* 5B, *Don Llambazo* 5F,  
*Don Jaime* ou *Conde Elias* 5C e G, *Conde*  
*Elrico* 5D, *Conde de Berjullita* 5E.

O nome da heroína, *Enilda(s)* em duas  
versões (A4 e 5) do primeiro cyclo, não ap-  
parece na segunda parte. Como na primeira  
secção, ella é filha de rei: *Princesa* 1, 2, *Prin-*  
*cesina* 2; *Infanta* 3, *Infantina* 2; 4 e 5 fazem-  
na esposa leal do Conde; seu pae menciona-se  
em todas as versões, exc. 3; 4 e 5 fazem  
menção d'um rei, quem, porém, nada tem que  
ver com a esposa do Conde.

O nome da competidora, *Doña Elvira* 2 42,  
lembra pelas suas vogaes e o acento tonico, o  
de *Enilda (vide supra)*; em 3 55, 57 ella é  
designada simplesmente como *la señora, hija*  
*de conde*, em 4 63 como *la desposada señora*  
e 119 *la novia*, em 5F (fim) como *la pobre*  
*de la promesa*, em quanto que nas outras  
versões a sua existencia se infere sómente  
da circumstancia de o heroe estar para casar.

Tocante a *geographia* dos nossos romances  
—que há uma até no folklore—duas palavras  
bastarao. Em 2, *Gerineldo* é um nobre fran-  
cez, ou de extracção franceza: para celebrar

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Pidal, *Rom. Astur.*, p. 285; e *Rev. Lusit.*, ii, p.  
196.

a boda elle volta para *Francia la natural* (l. 52);  
tambem na linha 35 se menciona a França.  
Em 5A 43-46 elle suppõe-se oriundo da Italia,  
ou ter-se estabelecido na Italia, porque a  
Condeza o vae buscar naquelle paiz; em 5B  
41 ella até volta *de d'allá d'Italia*, e em 4 31  
peregrina *por Italia y Francia*, em quanto  
que ás versões 5C e E lhes basta fazel-a recor-  
rer a vizinhança de Carthagená ou de Sevilha.  
—Em 3 47, 48 e 4 84 a Infanta (ou sêja Condeza)  
declara ser natural de Castella ou de His-  
panha. E bem certo que lhe podemos vindicar  
o sangue hispanico em todas as lições,  
porque em todas o centro ou meio geographico  
no qual se colloca ou de que parte a acção, é  
a Peninsula, o theatro da guerra fixando-se  
n'ella. (Á Hispanha é verdade que em 3 e 5A,  
F se substitue a França, tão familiar aos anti-  
gos jograes, ao pass que o nome de Portugal  
se mantem em todas as variantes).

#### OS MOTIVOS.

I. Das duas versões (Pidal nº 5 e Munthe  
nº 2) nas quaes este romance se encontra íntima  
e, na consciencia do povo, inseparavelmente  
fundido com o primeiro romance de *Gerineldo*,  
sómente a primeira procura estabelecer entre  
elles um rigoroso nexó mental, interpolando  
as duas linhas :

Yo iré á la guerra, señor,  
para echárselo (i. e. o vestido) mas fino,

Cf. vol. vii, col. 464, '8bis.'

#### a. SEPARAÇÃO.

II. Grandes guerras se publican . . .; o  
héroe, capitão general.

III. despede-se da Infanta com quem el-Rei  
(na conclusão da primeira parte) acaba de  
casar [2, 6 'voime *fortuna á buscar*']—ou sêja  
da Condeza sua esposa, dando-lhe nas mais  
versões formalmente a permissão de casar se  
elle não voltar dentro de certa epoca. Pranto  
da mulher 3, 4, 5.

#### b. PEREGRINAÇÃO.

IV. Os sete annos tradicionaes do folklore  
transcorrem—seis, oito e até dez annos no  
*Conde Sol*—sem o heroe voltar nem dar  
novas.

V. A Infanta, etc., pede licença a seu pae  
para ir a buscar a seu marido. As versões  
aparentadas 4, 5 amplião um pouco esta

scena; em 5D o pae da a permissão com as palavras:

Demana 'n á la Diosa (!)  
que llicencia t'en dará.

VI. Tendo vestido de romeira (*romerita* 5C, *pelegrina* 5E etc.), ella anda tres 1 ou sete reinos 2, ou  *cien legoas, para las quiñientas ba 3, ciento leguas 5A, siete leguas (!) 5C*; em 4 ella caminha pela França e Italia em busca do marido. Em 5B a Condeza

de promte demana als criados  
que la vajin accompanyá—

o que parece un modernismo bastante insipido.

VII. A romeira topa com uma vaccada. Interrogatorio dirigido ao rabadão sobre o dono da fazenda, acabando com a nova de Gerineldo estar em vespas de casar.—Esta scena, muito mais comprida e elaborada no romance do *Conde Claros* (4 37-64) do que nos outros, é, com varios outros rasgos, uma prova de o dito romance ser uma ampliação artistica do assumpto poetico que vem tratado na segunda parte do *Gerineldo*. Teremos que dizer mais umas palavras sobre este ponto na conclusão do presente artigo.

Note-se, no questionario da Princeza, uma das phrases feitas do folk-lore peninsular:

que me niegues la mentira,  
que me digas la verdade— 1, 19, 20.

e, parecidamente, em 3 e 4. E mais um rasgo. Em 1, 18 e 4, 38 a romeira conjura o rabadão pela santa Trindade que falle a verdade; ella serve-se da mesma invocação para obter de seu pae a permissão para a sua peregrinação 4 24, quando pede esmola 3 38 ou 123, e em 5A 14 quando objecta a seu pae, commo não ser licito

que mientras el Conde visca  
Condesa 's torni á casá.

Em 4 66 a Condeza pede o saial do vaqueirinho *por la santa Soledade*.

Um incidente particular á variante de Pidal: a romeira, depois de ouvir a fatal nova,

cayó al suelo desmayada (2, 23).—

Nos romances da *Boda interrumpida* não há vaccada nem rabadão; ahí, uns *pagecitos* A, ou um *patge chico* 5B, vêm a passar com os cavallos de *Don Lombardo*, etc., para os

abreviar numa fonte. Dialogo muito breve.

O interrogatorio nos nossos romances 'recorda questionarios parecidos de varios contos e cantos nacionaes e internacionaes (*Gato com botas*.—*Marques de Carabás*, etc.),' conforme advirte a Snra C. M. de Vasconcellos.<sup>19</sup> Wolf y Hofmann<sup>20</sup> enunciação similhante juizo, o qual é rejeitado pelo Snr. Child.<sup>21</sup>

VIII. Em 1 e 2, a romeira da 'uma moeda' ao vaqueiro para que lhe ensine a casa e a leve ao portal; os pagens em 5A, B acompanhão-na sem receber recompensa (Em 3 ella offerce o dinheiro ao principio do interrogatorio, l. 24 ou 109). Em 5B, somente agora a Condeza *s'en vesteix de pobrecita* (l. 35), e em 4 ella troca a sua roupa de seda pelo saial do vaqueiro para se apresentar na casa do Conde.

#### C. RECONCILIAÇÃO.

IX. A romeira pede esmola (*una c'ritat* 5B 40), o dono da casa da-lh'a (dous maravidis 1, um real de prata 3). Em 1 e 3 ella lembra-lhe que *en mi palacio* (ou: *dalgun dia*) . . . *mas limosna solia dar*. Em 2, Gerineldo encomenda-lhe que informe a Princeza que já está livre, em 5A pergunta por novas da Italia e de sua mulher; e em 5B, quando ella diz que a mulher do Conde chorará se ouvir que elle tornou a casar, elle pergunta:

¿com ne plorará la trista  
si já n'es morta temps ha?—

Em 5E não se menciona a esmola, mas a peregrina

de tan lluny com lo va veure  
al peu se li ajonollá.

X. Lucta interior e duvida do amante, quem crê ver o diabo diante de si vindo para o tentar 1, 2, 4.

XI. A peregrina da-se a conhecer por sua *mujer naturale, verdadera* ou *esposa leal*: em 1 ella faz-o por meio d'um 'papel,' nas variantes 5 por meio d'algun antigo recordeo que lhe ensina (*faldellí* e *anell d'or* 5A, *diamant* 5B, *ab un reberó que porta al fondo del faldillá* 5F) ou ainda *amb el brillo en el parlá* 5C.—

<sup>19</sup> *Rev. Lusit.* ii, p. 197.

<sup>20</sup> *Primavera* ii, p. 52, nota.

<sup>21</sup> *Ballads* ii, p. 461, nota 2.



Em 2, a romeira, depois de se ter descoberto, declara que a boda será por a sua rival D<sup>a</sup> Elvira e que ella vae rematar a sua vida n'um convento.

XII. O heroe vai casar com a fiel amante e parte com ella para o seu castello.—A forma original deste episodio final parece ter-se conservado em 2 47-52, abstrahindo talvez da menção feita da França na ultima linha; as linhas 103-118 de 4 são uma ampliação artistica da mesma scena, e o trecho correspondente (l. 45-50) de 1 tem sido em parte remodelado para poder serzir com o romance o accrescento postigo seguinte:

No bebais, caballos mios,  
de las orillas del mare,  
porque está el agua salada  
y puede faceros male.

Em quanto a esta allocução dirigida aos cavallos—originariamente uma formula de benção e de bom agouro, mas completamente disparatada na presente situação, e muito alterada da lição primitiva—, vêja-se *Rev. Lusit.* ii, p. 196. As variantes 5A,B reduzem a scena da partida ás palavras: *s'en gagan mano por mano y á casa van aná*, e: *al quarto varen entrá*; 5F: *los dos quedaren casats*.

A alegria dos amantes reunidos, não manifestada em 2, converte-se em *rico cantare* em 1; em 4 113, 114 a esposa

—de alegre y contento  
no cesaba de llorar;

nas variantes catalãs parece que os actores dispõem d'uma particular profusão de pranto e outras delicadissimas expressões da sua emoção (*lloros* 5A: *patons y abressadas* 5B; y *lloran qui mes podrá* 5D).

Conforme vimos mais alto, o texto da scena final de 3, depois da altercação das rivaes, admite duas interpretações divergentes, das quas a primeira, comtudo, parece preferivel, como mais conforme com o espirito geral da lenda.

XIII. Alguns dos romances congéneres mencionão a segunda noiva na scena do desenlace. 4 diz que

qued'ídose ha la novia  
vestidica y sin casare,

e 5F:

la pobre de la promesa  
no feya sinó plorá;

estes ultimos versos são tirados *ipsissimis verbis* da versão 5A, 5, 6—scena do pranto da Condeza—, substituindo apenas a *promesa* pela *Condesa*,

XIV. O epimythio.—Na variante de Munthe, Gerineldo 'fecha o romance com um epimythio em que se enuncia sentenciosamente'

que los amores primeros  
son muy malos de olvidar,

o qual se encontra tambem, algum tanto deturpado, na 'Boda interrompida' 5A, como observação do poeta:

que las primeras mujeres  
mal se poden olvidá.

No romance do Conde Sol, depois de descrever o estado de desamparo em que fica a rival engeitada, o poeta accrescenta, lembrando a gralha depennada da fabula:

que quien lo ajeno viste  
desnudo suele quedar.<sup>22</sup>

Depois de termos assignalado, nos argumentos e no exame comparativo dos motivos, as particularidades mais relevantes das varias versões, pouco resta dizer respeito á sua *authenticidade* relativa.

A variante 1 apresenta um bom texto popular; dicção sobria e singela; leve omissão depois da linha 8, confusão no desfecho, falso remate.

2 é igualmente uma redacção bastante estrema; umas poucas adulterações (linhas 6; 23; 35 e 52 a França; 41-44 D<sup>a</sup> Elvira, convento) já se mencionáram.

O vulgarismo muito marcado que afeia e estraga toda a lição 3, com a sua obliteração dos motivos, a deslocação de linhas e as infiltrações de modernismos e phrases convençionaes, não lhe faz merecer outro nome senão o d'uma recitação hodierna muito deturpada do nosso romance.—As tres ultimas quadras provão que o original directo d'esta variante differe do de todas as outras redacções.

As versões catalãs 5, estreitamente irmanadas pelo fundo com as castelhanas, têm conservado ainda ellas o cunho de populares castiças, apesar de apimentadas com uns poucos modernismos; algumas modificações: o pa-

<sup>22</sup> Cf. as observações sobre os riffs e anexins d'esta classe, na *Rev. Lusit.* ii, pp. 178, 198, 199.



gem em logar do vaqueiro, e os varios signaes pelos quaes a Condeza se da a conhecer (que recordão o 'papel' da lição 4).

O romance do *Conde Sol* 4, por muito mais detalhado e elaborado no desenho das situações e incidentes, presume de artistico e caracteriza-se como remodelação jogralesca da epoca escripta e de erudição. Mas não por isso devemos concluir que, na consciencia e na practica poetica popular, o nome do Conde Sol se associasse com o nosso romance mais tarde do que o de Gerineldo. Talvez haja razões para presumirmos o contrario. Eu, por minha parte, inclino-me a acceitar sem restrição as luminosas observações do Snr. Menendez Pidal.<sup>23</sup> Tendo exposto como el-Rei obriga a Gerineldo a casar com a Infanta em castigo da sua culpa e lhe aconselha que a vista de saial, elle continúa: 'no conforme la multitud con la aristocrática tendencia de este sarcasmo, protestó de ella como pudo, haciendo del humilde paje un tipo pundonoroso y noble . . .', que conquista honores e riquezas e, já poderoso e bem quisto das gentes, vai casar em terras remotas com uma grande senhora. D'esta maneira os rhapsodes populares chegarão, por um simples cambio de nome, a serzir o romance do *Conde Sol* com o de *Gerineldo*, 'con el solo designio de dejar á éste mejor parado que de otra manera quedaba.'<sup>24</sup>—Logo o texto 4 seria uma remodelação erudita do romance do *Conde Sol*, o qual na sua forma primordial era anterior aos de *Gerineldo* ii e serviu presumivelmente de modelo directo para elles.

Antes de concluir, quizera chamar a attenção para a sorprendente analogia—até nos pormenores da narração dos romances ali commentados com certos cantos populares d'outros paizes.

1º Na *canzone di Moran d'Inghilterra*, da qual Nigra publicou duas versões (A, B),<sup>25</sup> não bem tem o heroe (*Moran, Morum, Mural, Morando*) casado (*sposato* ou *fidanzato*) com a filha do Sultão que a deixa; depois de transcorridos os typicos sete annos, ella caminha por toda a Inglaterra (n'outra versão; *girà tiita la Fransa*) e topa com um vaqueiro (*man-*

<sup>23</sup> *Romances Astur.*, p. 285.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. também *Rev. Lucit.* ii, p. 196, nota 1: 'O povo gosta muito das *Segundas Partes* . . .'

*driano di vacche Gerolamo, Girom*), ou com duas lavandeiras. Interrogatorio. Ella da de esporas ao seu cavallo, chega para a boda, e refusa de beber até que *Maran* a abraça e reconhece dona (*padrona*) da casa.

2º A ballada escocesa de *Lord Beichan* (*Young Beachen, Bekie*) e *Suzeta* (*Shusy, Susan*) *Pye*, filha do Moiro; quatorze variantes na collecção de Child,<sup>26</sup> quem nega que esta ballada estêja *derivada* da lenda de Gilberto Becket, pae do famoso arcebispo São Thomas Cantuariense,<sup>27</sup> e cita numerosas parallelas dinamarquezas, islandezas, noruegas, suecas (*Herre Per* e *Jomfrue Ellensborg*).

Assumpto parecido com o dos romances de *Gerineldo* ii e do *Conde Sol* encontra-se em mais algumas poesias populares, mas com os papeis cambiados, pois o marido é quem busca a dama. Taes são o extensissimo romance castelhano do *Conde Dirlos*<sup>28</sup> (ou: *d'Irlos*; 1366 linhas, ass. *á-e*) e a ballada de *Hind Horn*,<sup>29</sup> com analogias escandinavas, flamengas e allemãs. Também ha afinidade secundaria entre o nosso cyclo e o romance catalão da *Nobre Porqueira* e da *Má Sogra*:

'El Rey n'ha fet fé una crida,  
una crida n'ha fet fé . . .—30'

Os romances da *Peregrina* e outros parentes dos de *Gerineldo* virão tratados em artigos especiaes, que espero dar ao prelo brevemente.

H. L. W. OTTO.

Cornell University.

#### KARL LENTZNER.

THE editors of the MOD. LANG. NOTES owe an apology to their readers for the publication of the article entitled "Historical Outline of the Danish Language" (MOD. LANG. NOTES,

<sup>25</sup> *Canti popolari* no. 42.—Il metro . . . è il doppio settenario tronco-piano, coll'assonanza nei piani. (Ex.: La fia d'ul Sultán || l'è tan na fia bela).

<sup>26</sup> *Ballads* (ii), no. 53.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* (ii), pp. 458, 459.

<sup>28</sup> Durán, *R. Gral.* no. 354, e *Primavera* (ii), no. 164.

<sup>29</sup> Child, *Ballads* (i), no. 17.

<sup>30</sup> Mil', *Rillo Cat.* no. 234 A-N; ass. *é*.

June, 1895), signed by Karl Lentzner, now of Oxford, England. They also owe thanks to several of their readers who have kindly made them aware of the editorial oversight to which the appearance of Lentzner's article in these columns is due. The article in question is a translation of Holthausen's sanctioned translation of an article by Ludwig Wimmer. Holthausen's translation appeared in *Germania* xxxi (N. R. xix), pp. 357 f., and is dated Dec. 30, 1895. These are the facts. The only comment I deem necessary is to beg Lentzner to read and heed what I have said of him in the *American Journal of Philology*, vol. ix, 502, and vol. xi, 512. Lentzner has now sinned most flagrantly in three instances which have been somewhat promptly discovered. If he has the temerity to continue in this way, editors will have to rely upon their own sagacity to keep them from being led into such humiliating apologies as that which I now make on behalf of the editors of this Journal.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### PHILOLOGICAL CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—Mr. Greene writing in your February issue of the Philological Congress at Philadelphia, makes the following statement: "This is the first occasion on which the Modern Language Association has become a fraction of a larger philological unit; for the simultaneous meetings of various societies held at Chicago in 1893 were an aggregate of integers. The program of the meetings at Philadelphia included both joint and simultaneous sessions."

I beg to say that the latter statement applies equally to the Chicago Congress, and that consequently the former statement is inaccurate. There were general sessions of the Chicago Congress on the twelfth and fourteenth of July, partly to bring the various bodies together, partly to do honor to our distinguished European guests. A reference to the programme (which I enclose) will substantiate this statement.

WILLIAM MORTON PAYNE,

Chairman Committee of Arrangements.

Chicago.

##### PHILOLOGICAL CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—I thank you for calling my attention to Mr. Payne's letter, and for giving me an opportunity to correct my statement, which, it appears, was not sufficiently guarded.

On referring to the programs of the general sessions, indicated by Mr. Payne, I find, however, that every paper presented was by a worker in ancient languages,—Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Assyriology, Comparative Philology; also that the presiding officers (in both cases admirably chosen) were classical scholars. In the sense that no other meetings were appointed for the same hour, these meetings might be regarded as general sessions, as they were set down on the program: practically, however, they were meetings of the American Philological Association, which all were invited to attend. I attended the very interesting session of July 12th; but I felt that I was present as a member of the American Philological Association, not of the Modern Language Association. The Secretary of the Modern Language Association informs me that he was never consulted with regard to the general sessions.

The program of the joint session at Philadelphia, at which papers were read, was prepared by joint action of the secretaries of the various associations, which were represented in the program as follows:—the American Philological Association was represented by two papers; the American Oriental Society, by two papers; the Modern Language Association of America, by two papers; the Archæological Institute of America, by one paper; the American Dialect Society, by one paper. This was, indeed, a joint program of a joint session: perhaps the terms "general session" and "joint session" will serve to indicate the difference in character between the meetings at Chicago and those at Philadelphia.

At the three joint sessions held at Philadelphia the presiding officers were the presidents, respectively, of the Modern Language Association of America, the American Philological Association, and the American Oriental Society.

HERBERT EVELETH GREENE.

Johns Hopkins University.



## MICHEL STROGOFF AGAIN.\*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—I regret that matters of importance compelled me to overlook temporarily the interesting rejoinder of Professor Lewis to my review of his edition of Verne's *Michel Strogoff*.<sup>1</sup>

I think I can show, to borrow the words of Gaston Paris,<sup>2</sup> that the editor has written "avec une vivacité qui, pour prendre volontiers une forme discrètement ironique, n'en est pas moins sensible."

Dr. Lewis thanks me for the review and then proceeds to correct "one or two suggestions" made therein. I propose to examine his corrections: "In such words as *complètement*," he remarks, "I retain Verne's spelling, for he often uses an acute accent over the *e* immediately preceding a mute *e*." What does Dr. Lewis mean? How "often" and where does Verne write an acute accent when other French writers use the grave? The Academy has been writing "*complètement*" since 1878,<sup>3</sup> and it would seem strange that Verne has not fallen in line. The editor cites no examples to support his statement.—The word "*très*" does not occur in my review.—Dr. Lewis "thought" students would understand the reference to "Delaware;" but mine did not understand it. He further remarks: "Podaroshna is explained, *I think*, in the course of the text." So it is, undoubtedly; but the explanation (p. 18, l. 29) occurs just three pages beyond the first occurrence of the word (p. 15, l. 25).—Now as to "tarentass" and "télègue:" I remarked simply that these words are not translated; their meanings are not differentiated.

In the English 'argument' on page 23 of the text, Dr. Lewis states that a "tarentass" is a Russian carriage, and he there also alludes to a "vehicle" preceding the "tarentass" in question. On page 24 of the text, Strogoff wonders who the travelers can be "dont la télègue précédait son tarentass." Right here

\* This correspondence was received before that of Professor Garner was published in our last issue.

<sup>1</sup> See MOD. LANG. NOTES for May, 1895, vol. x, 300-308.

<sup>2</sup> In his criticism of Jeanroy's *Origines de la Poésie Lyrique*.

<sup>3</sup> Hatzfeld et Darmesteter, *Dict. de la langue franç.*, s. v.

the intelligent student looks in the notes to find the difference—if any there be—between "tarentass" and "télègue." The expected note is lacking, as I stated in my review, and not until the word "télègue" occurs again ten pages in advance of this point, are we told (p. 36, note) that the two vehicles are "two varieties of Russian vehicles." The word "iemschik" occurs first in line 6 of page 25, and it is in a note to line 6 page 25, that the student has a right to expect an explanation of the term. None is given. As in the case of "podaroshna," "télègue" and "tarentass," the desired information is given for the first time in a note to a subsequent page of the text.—I still think the note to "pour qui" too vague to be of service to the student, and the fact that Dr. Lewis "rather likes" the term "neuter pronoun" has no bearing on my observation that a reference to the grammar is here lacking.

I am quite aware that literal translation can be carried too far; I hardly thought it necessary to insist that a "cheval de fond" is a horse of good bottom, a horse that has wind and endurance, and not a dancing horse, for example, although such beasts are to be found, I believe, and we cannot deny that they have "good qualities."

Again, it is scarcely necessary for the editor to state anew so many accepted facts about the word *tout*; nor can I agree with the statement that "in an elementary text-book such niceties of spelling need not be considered, and especially as they are not mentioned in such a work as Whitney's large French grammar." That Whitney does not mention niceties of spelling is no proof that they—to keep the plural—are not desirable.

But it is the hypothesis with which Dr. Lewis begins the last paragraph of his "correspondence" that seems especially to demand examination. It appears that the editor read "whatever material he could find on Verne's life;" that he "was rather amused at three statements contained in generally reliable works;" and that his "amusement was caused by the wide difference of opinion on the birth and life of an author so well known as Jules Verne." "So" he continues, "I quoted these three statements." But when



the editor quotes a journal which distinctly states that Verne is a pen-name, he should surely mention that the quoted statement is contrary to fact. He writes in a note: "So far as I know at present" the statement in Johnson's *Cyclopædia* is correct. Why did he not state *definitely* which of his three conflicting sources contained facts? His note (quoted later) left me in doubt as to the nationality of Verne, for the note shows clearly that the editor was uncertain at the time of writing. In order to settle the point of nationality for my pupils I consulted various dictionaries of pseudonyms and wrote to M. Verne. The fact that the author was "not mentioned" in those dictionaries of pseudonyms dispelled doubts raised by the editor, and M. Verne's pleasant letter<sup>4</sup> is evidence enough that "the dictionaries and catalogues cited by Mr. Symington" are not his only sources for the biography of contemporaries.

Dr. Lewis closes his rejoinder with irony which would perhaps be more effective if its point did not lie in the fact that my printed statement was misquoted. Surely he must have seen the importance of the bracketed numerals in my sentence "this (1828) is the correct statement," and yet he quotes the sentence, but omits the date!

Dr. Lewis thinks that when my remarks are compared with his biographical note most editors will agree with him "in thinking that such criticism is more careless, to say the least" than his note appears. Perhaps it will be well to quote, without omission, that part—the only part—of the Biographical Note in which allusion is made to the birth and nationality of Verne.

#### [BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.]

The material already in existence for Jules Verne's life is most meagre and contradictory. In the *Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica* (iv, p. 734), for example, we read that he was born at *Nantes* on the 8th of February, 1814. According to Johnson's *New Universal Cyclopædia* (iv, p. 1137) he was born at *Nantes* on the 8th of February, 1828.<sup>5</sup> *The Dial* (xiv, p. 289), on the other hand, has the following quotation from the *London Literary World*: "Though the literary world does not seem to know it, 'Jules Verne' is only

a pen-name. The novelist is by birth a Pole—a native of *Warsaw*—and his real name is Olchewitz. When he began to write he adopted the expedient of translating the initial syllable of his family patronymic (which in English means 'beach') into its French equivalent, and in this way he got 'Verne'."

The estimates of the value of his works apparently differ to a like degree.

<sup>5</sup> So far as I know at present, this is the correct statement].

W. STUART SYMINGTON.

*Amherst College.*

#### THE NOVEL AND THE STORY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The criticism passed by Dr. Deering, in your November number, on my attempt to distinguish the novel from the story seems to me to be well-founded in theory and justified by facts; for instance, in the case of *Lazarillo de Tormes*, which had occasioned me considerable perplexity. My own differentiation between the two had never been satisfactory to me, but intent only on tracing the one kind, I neglected to look into the essence of the other. Since Dr. Deering privately brought the matter to my attention some months ago, I have had no opportunity to test historically his definition of the story; nor is there in Cleveland sufficient material available for the purpose. But some questions arose while I was reading mediæval literature with the origin of the novel chiefly in view, which may be worth while to state.

One noticeable feature of the literature which tended to make up the romance of chivalry—the epic literature, roughly speaking—is that it was not used to any great extent by the later story-tellers. Even the *romans d'aventure*, which, in many cases, require but a prose form to make them excellent stories, are hardly ever drawn upon—so far at least as known manuscripts indicate. Indeed there would seem to be an almost conscious avoidance of the domain of the novel by the partisans of its lighter rival. The conclusion would be then that the ancestor of the story is not the same as the progenitor of the novel, and therefore that the essential difference between the novel and the story is inherited from a previous stage of existence, the poetical stage. This conclusion may be arbitrary, depending

<sup>4</sup> Published M. L. N., x, 305.

on insufficient premises. Investigation will determine whether it is hasty or not.

This negative statement, as to what are apparently not the sources of the story, may be supplemented by a positive one as to its probable progenitors. The earliest compilation of stories which became popular in Europe is the Latin collection *Disciplina clericalis*, of Petrus Alphonsus. It was made up of moral tales taken from Arabian writers. This organized invasion of the West by Oriental parables was aided by the many scattered anecdotes which pilgrims, crusaders or merchants brought from the East, and by shorter collections in manuscript, such as the one passing under the name of *The Seven Wise Men*. With their moral summaries lopped off, all these narratives may have been made acceptable to the unlettered people.

Still the appetite for stories was not created in western Europe by these wanderers from distant lands. The poem known as *le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* is abundant proof to the contrary, not to mention many other early intimations of the same spirit. This native liking for amusing episodes soon found literary expression in that form of poetry called *fableau*, which appeared in France by the middle of the twelfth century.

Now the first prose stories in the vernacular of which we have any evidence are to be found in Italian compilations of the last part of the thirteenth century. The earliest of these, which goes by the name of *Dodici Conti Morali*, contains eight stories, some certainly and others presumably the abridgment of French *fableaux* or poetical *contes dévots*. The *Conti di Antichi Cavalieri*, a little later in date, is more historical in theme and summarizes for the most part longer French poems, while the *Novellino* of about the same period is a much more ambitious collection of narratives from Latin and Italian sources as well as French. These tales were the precursors of Boccaccio's *novelle*. They prove that already, half a century and more before his day, it was the fashion to reduce the episodic poems of France to prose form, and multiply the narratives thus obtained by like themes gleaned from other literatures.

The question then is whether the prose ver-

sions of the French *fableaux* gave the model for these Italian *novelle*, just as the prose romances of the Breton cycle became the starting-point for the romances of chivalry. The tone of the *novella* is certainly akin to the tone of the *fableau*, though it rises at times to the more respectable tale of moral instruction. If the story began with the *fableau* it assimilated to itself all the lighter (in theme or form) fiction of the day, even to the reduction to a literary narrative of the more notable experiences of contemporary life. The *fableau* spirit would seem to prevail with Boccaccio, and yet the larger part of his *Decameron* he undoubtedly owed to entirely different sources. Possibly further discoveries of manuscripts, or the publication of what are already known but still neglected, may throw some light on the problem. Yet it would seem as though we have enough established facts to understand why the story differs from the novel in quality, as Dr. Deering urges, and not in quantity, as I affirmed. It is because their literary ancestors belonged to different clans.

F. M. WARREN.

Adelbert College.

#### CENTRAL MODERN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

DEAR SIRs:—The growing importance of educational interests in the western states has within the last years given rise to several organizations. The instructors of modern languages in western institutions have for some time felt the want of closer coöperation. For natural reasons the meetings of the Modern Language Association have been held almost exclusively in the East; distance and expense have thus deprived a large number of teachers of the direct benefits resulting from a personal acquaintance and a mutual exchange of thought and experience.

The initiative in a movement to provide instructors in the Middle West with the facilities of intercourse and coöperation was taken by representatives of the universities of Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa. A circular letter issued in May to a number of modern-language men



selected from different sections called forth encouraging replies. On Friday, June 28, a preliminary meeting was held in Chicago by the men whose names had been suggested, to consider the question of a permanent organization. The communications sent by professors in leading institutions confirmed the conviction of all members present that a far larger number of modern-language teachers could be interested by a separate organization than by an occasional meeting of the Modern-Language Association in the West. It was unanimously agreed to avoid any conflict with the interests and support of the older association, and the pursuit of the common aim. The date of the annual meeting will be so chosen as to allow members to attend both associations.

The name of the society was decided upon as the CENTRAL MODERN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE. The following officers and committees, to serve till the first regular convention, were appointed:

*President:* PROF. W. H. CARRUTH, University of Kansas.

*Secretary and Treasurer:* PROF. H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG, University of Chicago.

*Committee on Constitution:*

PROF. CH. B. WILSON, Iowa State University.

PROF. G. E. KARSTEN, Indiana State University.

PROF. L. FOSSLER, Nebraska State University.

*Committee on Programme:*

PROF. G. E. KARSTEN, Indiana State University.

PROF. STARR W. CUTTING, University of Chicago.

PROF. W. M. BASKERVILL, Vanderbilt University.

PROF. H. EDGREN, Nebraska State University.

*Committee on Arrangements:*

PROF. H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG, University of Chicago.

PROF. A. H. TOLMAN, University of Chicago.

PROF. J. D. BRUNER, University of Chicago.

The first meeting will be held at the University of Chicago, December 30-January 1. You are cordially and urgently invited to attend.

The enclosed Provisional Constitution of the Central Modern Language Conference will give an outline of the aims proposed.

Papers to be read at the convention should be sent (by title) to Prof. G. E. Karsten, Bloomington, Indiana, as early as convenient—before December 1—as a large number of contributions have already been secured.

More detailed information will be issued as soon as the programme is definitely settled upon and other arrangements perfected.

Trusting that you will lend your support to this undertaking and hoping for an early reply, I remain

Respectfully yours,

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG,

*Secretary of the C. M. L. A.*

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE CENTRAL MODERN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE.

##### ARTICLE I.

1. The name of this Society shall be THE CENTRAL MODERN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE.

2. Its object shall be the advancement of the scientific study and teaching of the modern languages and literatures.

##### ARTICLE II.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, and a Treasurer.

2. There shall be an Executive Committee of nine, composed of the above officers and four other members of the Conference.

3. The officers and the Executive Committee shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

##### ARTICLE III.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Conference at such place and at such time as at a preceding annual meeting shall have been determined upon.

2. At the annual meeting, the Secretary and the Treasurer shall present their annual reports.

3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the meetings shall be directed by the Executive Committee.

4. The Executive Committee may call special meetings.

##### ARTICLE IV.

1. Any one recommended by the Executive



Committee may become a member of the Conference by the payment of two dollars, and may continue a member by the payment of the same amount each year.

2. Failure in payment of the annual fee for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

#### ARTICLE V.

1. All papers designed for the Conference shall be submitted, through the Secretary, to the Executive Committee at least one month in advance of the meeting, and the action of this Committee regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Conference, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

#### ARTICLE VI.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at the last session of any regular annual meeting, provided the proposed amendments have received the approval of the Executive Committee.

Committee on Constitution. { Charles Bundy Wilson,  
State University of Iowa.  
Gustav E. Karsten,  
State University of Indiana.  
Laurence Fossler,  
State University of Nebraska.

### CENTRAL MODERN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES.

SIRS:—The Central Modern Language Conference will have its first meeting in Chicago on Dec. 30 and 31, and Jan. 1st. President Harper will give an address of welcome and papers will be presented by Professors Eggert, late of Vanderbilt University, Food of Albion College, Gerber of Earlham College, Hempl of Michigan University, Howe of Butler University; Karsten and Leser of the University of Indiana; De Poyen, Schmidt-Wartenberg and Tolman of the University of Chicago. Further offers of papers will be welcome.

G. E. KARSTEN,

Chairman of the Program Committee.

The University of Indiana.

#### BRIEF MENTION.

The next annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America will be held at Yale University, New Haven, Conn., December 26, 27, 28. The President of the Association, Professor James Morgan Hart, will deliver an address December 26, at 8 o'clock, p. m. The following is a partial list of the papers which will be read at the regular sessions: Mr. Robert N. Corwin (Yale University), "Goethe's attitude toward contemporary politics;" Prof. Gustav Gruener (Yale University), "The *Nibelungenlied* and *Sage* in modern poetry;" Prof. J. T. Hatfield (Northwestern University), "John Wesley's translations (versions) of German hymns;" Prof. Andrew Ingraham (Swain Free School), "Overlapping and Multiple Indications;" Prof. L. Oscar Kuhns (Wesleyan University), "Treatment of Nature in the *Divine Comedy*;" Prof. M. D. Learned (University of Pennsylvania), "The Saga of Wilhelm Tell;" Prof. P. B. Marcou (Harvard University), "The origin of the rule forbidding hiatus in French verse;" Prof. John M. Manley (Brown University), "Marco Polo and the *Squire's Tale*;" Prof. A. R. Marsh (Harvard University), "The Comparative Study of Literature;" Prof. Brander Matthews (Columbia University), "The Conventions of the Drama;" Prof. Bliss Perry (Princeton University), "Fiction as a College study;" Prof. Thomas R. Price (Columbia University), "*Troilus and Criseyde*: a study of Chaucer's method of narrative construction;" Dr. J. H. Penniman (University of Pennsylvania), "Notes on Ben Jonson's Quarrel with Marston;" Prof. H. S. White (Cornell University), "The home of Walter von der Vogelweide;" Dr. Max Winkler (University of Michigan), "The sources of the dramaturgical ideas of Lenz;" Prof. George M. Wahl (Williams College), "Goethe's *Faust* and Ein Christlich Meynender;" Prof. C. H. A. Wager (Center College), "The *Seege of Troye*, a Middle English romance;" Prof. C. B. Wright (Middlebury College), "Two parallel studies in sociology: a comparison of certain features in a drama by Shakespeare and one by Ibsen."

Each member of the Association will soon receive a printed copy of the complete programme.













PB  
1  
M6  
v.10

Modern language notes

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---

